Vol. LXXV, No. 1 July, 1926

The Ecclesiastical Review

Monthly Publication for the Clergy Cum Approbatione Superiorum

BX
801
.E17
v.75

CONTENTS

APOSTOLATE OF SS. CYRIL AND METHODIUS AND CHURCH UNITY 1
The Right Rev. Monsignor FRANCIS GRIVEC, D. D., Ljubljana, Jugoslavia.
THE TESTIMONY OF JOSEPHUS TO CHRIST 6
The Rev. HERBERT THURSTON, S.J., London, England.
WHEN DID CHRIST'S PASSION BEGIN?.. 16
The Right Rev. ALEXANDER MacDONALD, D. D , Toronto, Canada.
FATHER JOHN MacENERY, PIONEER IN PALEONTOLOGY. 23
JAMES J. WALSH, M D., New York City.
THE AMERICAN CATHOLIC PHILOSOPHICAL ASSOCIATION 40
The Rev. JAMES H. RYAN, D. D., Washington, D. C.
THE ARCHBISHOP'S POCKET-BOOK
IX. Clerical Training 47
X. Seminary Professors. 58
CATHOLIC STATISTICS OF THE UNITED STATES. 69
The Rev. MICHAEL J. McBURNEY, Natrona, Pennsylvania.
TWO CONVENIENT MARRIAGE TABLES 73
The Rev. GEORGE JOSEPH DONNELLY, St. Louis, Missouri.
SUMMARY OF AN IMPORTANT MARRIAGE CASE 80
THE WHITE CLERICAL HABIT FOR THE SOUTH 81
THE CATHOLIC CHURCH AND PROHIBITION. 84
The Rev. JAMES B. McLAUGHLIN, O S.B., Carlisle, England.
RECENT BIBLE STUDY 89
The Rev. WILLIAM H. McCLELLAN, S.J., Woodstock, Maryland.

CONTENTS CONTINUED INSIDE

AMERICAN ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW

PUBLISHED AT
113 E. Chestnut Street
Lancaster, Pa.

THE DOLPHIN PRESS
Philadelphia

GENERAL OFFICES
1305 Arch Street
Philadelphia, Pa.

Copyright, 1926: American Ecclesiastical Review—The Dolphin Press

Subscription Price: United States and Canada, $4.00—Foreign Postage, $1.00 additional

Sole Agents { Great Britain: Burns, Oates & Washbourne. 8 Paternoster Row, London, E. C., 4
Ireland: Catholic Truth Society of Ireland, 24 Upper O'Connell St., Dublin
Australia: W. P. Linehan, 8 Bourke St., Melbourne

Entered, 2 July, 1924, as Second Class Matter, Post Office at Lancaster, Pa., under Act of 3 March, 1879

Altar Wine Supremacy

SINCE 1877

The COVICK Altar Wines are produced in California and are the only wines having the unqualified approval and commendation of all the Bishops of California.

✣ ✣ ✣

The Chancellor of the San Francisco Archdiocese supervises the making and distribution of the COVICK wines under the authority of His Grace the Most Reverend Archbishop.

The COVICK wines are not only valid and licit matter for the Holy Sacrifice; they are mature wines of the very highest grade and dependability.

✣ ✣ ✣

The COVICK altar wines, because of their rich mellow wholesome character are the ideal wines for the fasting priest and no wines anywhere in America are comparable with them.

✣ ✣ ✣

For the convenience of the Clergy throughout the country the COVICK Mass Wines may be obtained from

The T. F. Rodden Agency
25 Barclay Street
New York City, N. Y.

Fee Brothers
21-27 North Water Street
Rochester, N. Y.

Sievers Church Goods Co.
228 East Commerce Street
San Antonio, Texas

The I. Donnelly Company
408-410 East Ninth Street
Kansas City, Mo.

William Moran Agency
873 Payne Avenue
St. Paul, Minn.

or direct from

The Covick Company
330 Stockton Street
San Francisco, Cal.

J. Redmond Covick, 27 North Franklin St., Chicago, Ill.

The Covick Company

Established 1877 **Incorporated 1900**

BROTHERHOOD CORPORATION

L. L. FARRELL (President)

Vineyards:

Washingtonville, Est. 1839
Livermore, California

Address all communications to:

New York Office
71 Barclay Street

Producers of the Finest Altar Wines in America

The Brotherhood is one of the oldest and largest Altar wine houses in this country. We allow no dealers to handle our Altar wines, all shipments being made direct to the Reverend Clergy from our vineyards at Washingtonville, New York.

Mr. L. L. Farrell, the President, has devoted his entire life to the Altar wine industry, and all shipments are made under his personal supervision.

Requests for price lists and application blanks will have prompt attention

CONTENTS CONTINUED

ANALECTA:

SACRA CONGREGAZIONE DEI SEMINARI E DELLE UNIVERSITA:

Letter from the Cardinal Prefect on the American Catholic Philosophical Association 64

S. POENITENTIARIA APOSTOLICA:

De Facultate absolvendi a Peccato Absolutionis Proprii Complicis... 67

DIARIUM CURIAE ROMANAE:

List of Recent Pontifical Appointments 68

STUDIES AND CONFERENCES:

Our Analecta—Roman Documents for the Month..... 69

Catholic Statistics of the United States Based on Figures from Pennsylvania. (*The Rev. Michael J. McBurney, Natrona, Pa.*)..... 69

Two Convenient Marriage Tables. (*The Rev. George Joseph Donnelly, St. Louis, Mo*)..... 73

Summary of an Important Marriage Case 80

The White Clerical Habit for the South. (*Ab Austro Veniens*) 81

The Catholic Church and Prohibition. (*The Rev. James Benedict McLaughlin, O.S.B., Carlisle, England.*)..... 84

The Sanctus Candle at Mass 87

ECCLESIASTICAL LIBRARY TABLE:

Recent Bible Study. (*The Rev. William H. McClellan, S.J., Woodstock, Md.*) 89

CRITICISMS AND NOTES:

Butler: The Life and Times of Bishop Ullathorne..... 98

Keller: Mass Stipends..... 100

Arendzen Prophets, Priests and Publicans 101

Williamson: The Book of Life 102

Whitehead: Science and the Modern World 103

Burtt: The Metaphysical Foundations of Modern Physical Science.....103

LITERARY CHAT..... .....105 BOOKS RECEIVED..... 110

ESSENTIALIA PHILOSOPHIAE

Quae in Usum Incipientium Digessit

FRANCISCUS P. SIEGFRIED

in Seminario S. Caroli Borromaei Philadelphiense Professor

Pocket Summary of Catholic Philosophy, giving the essentials of **Logic, Ontology, Cosmology, Psychology, Theodicy, Ethics,** briefly, clearly, in form of question and answer.

All set forth in graphic survey. For students of Philosophy in the Seminary and for maturer students who desire to make a rapid review of their Philosophy.

$1.80 a copy postpaid

American Ecclesiastical Review 1305 Arch Street, Philadelphia

IN the REVIEW advertisements, which are fresh each month, there is much of personal interest and of news value to the subscribers. Many of the advertisers send a change of picture and of copy for each issue, and the illustrations show the improvement that is being constantly made in ecclesiastical designing and furnishing. More and more, priests are coming to recognize this feature of the magazine, and it is gratifying to know that, when they have occasion to order from the houses that address them through the REVIEW, they say that they saw the advertisement in THE ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

☞ Subscribers should be on their guard against impostors who represent themselves as agents of the REVIEW. There is no agent authorized to collect money for the REVIEW.

Firms with Episcopal Authorization to Handle Sacred Vessels to Repair Them

BALTIMORE:	**JOHN MURPHY CO.**, Park Avenue and Clay Street.
BOSTON:	**BIGELOW KENNARD & CO.**, 511 Washington Street. **THOS. J. FLYNN & CO.**, 62-64 Essex Street. **MATTHEW F. SHEEHAN COMPANY**, 17 and 19 Beach St. **PATRICK J. GILL**, 387 Washington Street.
CHICAGO:	**BENZIGER BROTHERS**, 205-207 W. Washington Street. (Factory in De Kalb Avenue and Rockwell Place, Brooklyn, N. Y.) **JOHN P. DALEIDEN CO.**, 1530-32 Sedgwick Street. **ECCLESIASTICAL GOODS CO.**, 984 Milwaukee Ave. **D. B. HANSEN & SONS**, 27 N. Franklin Street. **EDWARD J. KOENIG COMPANY**, 10 South La Salle Street. **SPAULDING & CO.**, Michigan Avenue and Van Buren St.
CINCINNATI:	**BENZIGER BROTHERS**, 429 Main Street. (Factory in De Kalb Avenue and Rockwell Place, Brooklyn, N. Y.) **FR. PUSTET CO.**, 436 Main Street.
CLEVELAND:	**NORTHERN OHIO PLATING WORKS**, 1501 Columbus Road
DENVER:	**JAMES CLARKE CHURCH GOODS HOUSE**, 638-40 Tremont St
LOS ANGELES:	**EDWARD J. KOENIG COMPANY**, 1107 South Main Street.
MILWAUKEE:	**BERGS MANUFACTURING CO.**, 483-485 Twenty-seventh Street. **DIEDERICH-SCHAEFER CO.**, 413 Broadway. **A. WERNER**, 649 E. Water Street.
NEW YORK:	**BENZIGER BROTHERS**, 36-38 Barclay Street. (Factory in De Kalb Avenue and Rockwell Place, Brooklyn, N. Y.) **THE FEELEY CO.**, 10 W. 50th Street. **THE GORHAM COMPANY**, 5th Avenue and 47th Street. **P. J. KENEDY & SONS**, 44 Barclay Street. **FR. PUSTET CO.**, 52 Barclay Street. **RAMBUSCH DECORATING CO.**, 2 West 45th Street. **THE C. WILDERMANN CO.**, 33 Barclay Street.
OMAHA:	**KOLEY AND SON**, 2910 Farnam Street.
PHILADELPHIA:	**H. L. KILNER, & CO.**, 1708 Market Street. **J. J. McDERMOTT**, Room 818, 1011 Chestnut Street. **F. C. PEQUIGNOT**, 1331 Walnut Street. **FRANK QUIN & CO.**, 46 North 9th Street. **HERMAN J. WOLF**, 539-543 W. Huntingdon Street. **WRIGHT MANUFACTURING CO.**, 127-35 Master Street.
PITTSBURGH:	**E. J. LETZKUS**, 2006 Jenkins Arcade.
PROVIDENCE:	**THE GORHAM COMPANY**, Elmwood. **W. J. SULLIVAN CO.**, 96 Jefferson Street. **JOSEPH TALLY**, 506-512 Westminster Street.
SEATTLE:	**THE KAUFER CO.**, 1607 Fourth Avenue.
ST. LOUIS:	**B. HERDER BOOK CO.**, 17 South Broadway. **MUELLER PLATING CO.**, 920 Pine St., Imperial Bldg
ST. PAUL:	**THE E. M. LOHMANN CO.**, 385 St. Peter St.

THE ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW

EIGHTH SERIES.—VOL. V.—(LXXV).—JULY, 1926.—NO. 1.

APOSTOLATE OF SAINTS CYRIL AND METHODIUS AND CHURCH UNITY.

THE reunion of Oriental schismatic communities with the Holy See is a subject of special importance to American ecclesiastics at the present moment when the permanent Committee of the Oriental Section of the International Eucharistic Congress has been in session at Chicago to discuss the action of the Apostolate of SS. Cyril and Methodius. Hence I readily comply with the request to write for the ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW a résumé of what action has been taken to render the work of the Apostolate effective.[1]

Of recent decades much has been done to bring about the union of all Christian Churches. A good mutual understanding among Christian nations and a reunion of schismatic Christians was one of the leading aims of Popes Leo XIII, Pius X, Benedict XIV, and Pius XI. It is also a special intention of the Holy Year. In all their works for Christian unity the Popes at Rome have particularly in mind the Christian Greco-Slavic Orient, long ago in union as one family with the Catholic Church, but now separated from her by a schism that has lasted for over one thousand years. It is easy to understand why the Popes are so solicitous about the Christian

[1] EDITOR'S NOTE.—The Right Rev. Monsignor Francis Grivec, D.D., is the foremost living protagonist of the reunion of the Eastern Schismatic Church question. At present he is a professor of Oriental Theology at the University of Ljubljana, Jugoslavia. His epoch-making works on *The Concept of the Primacy and of the Unity of the Church in Oriental Theology,* and *The Church* were dedicated to the Holy Father, from whom he at once received warm commendation for his splendid efforts for the reunion of the Churches. Both books deserve to be translated into English.

Orient. Schismatic Oriental Churches are much nearer the Catholic Church than any other Christian Church. The Oriental schismatic Churches retained even in schism a validly ordained hierarchy, valid priesthood and sacraments, especially the Holy Eucharist. Besides, all the Oriental schismatic Churches excel in venerating the Blessed Virgin, the Mother of God.

It is the Holy Eucharist and the veneration of the Blessed Virgin that give the special distinction to the schismatic Oriental Churches and make them essentially different from many other non-Catholic sects. The Holy Eucharist, mystic bond of union among Catholics ("sacramentum unitatis, vinculum caritatis," as St. Augustine calls it), is the specific bond of union that brings us Catholics into close relation with the schismatic Oriental Christians. For that reason the schism touches to the quick the mystic body of Christ. How natural then it is to discuss the union of Churches in any and all International Eucharistic Congresses. How natural and timely, that Pope Pius XI decreed and expressed his personal wish, that in all International Eucharistic Congresses a special section on Oriental Churches be established to consider the question and popularize the idea of the ultimate union of Eastern schismatics with the Catholic Church.

The question of Church unity is essentially a religious one. To solve it satisfactorily, prayer is indeed necessary. The Nuncio Apostolic at Prague, Czecho-Slovakia, the Most Rev. Dr. Marmaggi, speaking at the Oriental Congress at Velehrad, Czecho-Slovakia, in 1924, very aptly said: "Deflenda scissio inconsutilis Christi vestis maxime in divinam caritatem offendit: divisio potius cordium quam mentium. Atqui caritatis restauratio opus habet gratiae, immo, in casu nostro, miraculum quodam in spirituali ordine insigne, quod nonnisi humiliter constanterque petentibus a Deo concedetur."

In this profound religious question theological science must also coöperate. The schismatic Oriental Christians are in theological education much behind the Catholic nations, but they are heirs of the old Oriental Christian culture, which, up to the tenth century, was the common property of the universal Catholic Church. After the schism cultural relations with the Christian Orient were for political reasons very much

hindered and cultural bonds broken. Of recent decades some of the cultural bonds of the Christian Orient with the Occident were partly renewed. Under the auspices of Leo XIII the Western Catholics started a systematic study of the Christian Orient. In 1917 Benedict XV established a special institute for the study of Oriental theology, through the "Institutum Pontificium Orientale", which is organized similarly to the "Institutum Biblicum". The basis of mutual understanding and mutual friendly feeling shall be scientific studies according to the intention beautifully expressed by Pius XI in his Encyclical "Ecclesiam Dei" (12 Nov., 1923): "illud persuasum habentes . . . ex recta rerum cognitione aequam hominum aestimationem itemque sinceram benevolentiam efflorescere, quae Christi caritate coniuncta, religiosae unitati quam maxime et, Dei munere, profutura". Catholic theology must even in its own interests consider the Christian Orient. A thorough knowledge of Oriental theological questions must become an essential part of theological education.

Alms and prayer of pious Catholics are necessary for any apostolic missionary work, so also for the proposed action for the coming reunion of the Churches. "Prayer and alms are the two wings carrying the angelic message throughout the world," says the pious Bishop Slomsek, founder of the "Confraternity of Sts. Cyril and Methodius".

All this is embodied in the "Apostolate of Sts. Cyril and Methodius," the pious union established for the reconciliation of the schismatic Orientals with the Catholic Church. Members say for this intention one Pater and Ave every day and give a small yearly offering for the union. Other devotional exercises may be proper for special occasions and places. Up to 1924 the "Apostolate of Sts. Cyril and Methodius" had been propagated as a popular sodality among the Bohemians, Slovaks, Slovenes, and Croatians; lately it has spread among the Germans, French, and even in America.

With the organization of scientific theological study of the Christian Orient in 1907, the "Apostolate of Sts. Cyril and Methodius" became in fact an international undertaking. In the same year it organized the first International Congress for the Study of the Oriental Churches. The Congress convened at Velehrad, Czecho-Slovakia. It met again in the same

place in 1909, in 1910, and with great splendor in 1924. At that time the Holy Father added solemnity and weight to the discussions at the Congress. In his allocution to the consistory of Cardinals, 18 December, 1924, the Holy Father voiced his approval and praise for the work of the Congress at Velehrad and for the intentions of the "Apostolate of Sts. Cyril and Methodius" and pointed to the close connexion of the work of the Eucharistic Congress at Amsterdam, Holland, and the Congress sponsored by the "Apostolate of Sts. Cyril and Methodius". In 1925 a congress "pro studiis Orientalibus" was held at Ljubljana, Jugoslavia. A splendid array of interested parties, of Catholic, Orthodox and Uniate bishops, prelates, priests and professors of theology, honored its meetings, among them three professors of the "Institutum Pontificium Orientale", Rome, under the leadership of the able P. M. d'Herbigny. The Holy Father remembered the Congress with an Apostolic Letter.

Well known specialists of Europe took an active part at all these congresses. Not only abstract scientific questions were discussed but practical methods were pointed out and recommended. Thus the former purely local organization of the "Apostolate of Sts. Cyril and Methodius" became the organized center for the international study and propagation of the ultimate practical union of the Churches.

In 1924, on the suggestion of the Apostolic Nuncio, Mgr. Marmaggi, the assembled bishops and learned men of European nations unanimously decided so to change and enlarge the statutes of the "Apostolate of Sts. Cyril and Methodius" as to make it capable of becoming an absolutely international confraternity. Now the Apostolate is known as "Apostolatus SS. Cyrilli et Methodii sub patrocinio B. V. Mariae, pium opus pro unitate Ecclesiae". Where Saints Cyril and Methodius may not be well known, the apostolate is to spread under the abbreviated name of "Pium Opus pro Unitate Ecclesiae". Cyril and Methodius are saints claiming a special title to be honored in our age as apostles of the Church's universality. Eastern and Western Slavs honor them as their apostles. Greeks by birth and education, they strenuously labored, in the ninth century, the age of Photius, for the propagation of the faith among the Slavs, always remaining in strict and unbroken

union with the Catholic Church of Rome. St. Cyril is buried in Rome in the Church of St. Clement, which is to-day in the hands of the Irish Dominican Fathers.

The apostolate is put under the special protection of the Blessed Virgin Mary, the common Mother of Christian Churches, both in the East and in the West. All who honor and love the Mother of Christ should also honor and love Holy Mother Church.

During and after the world war the traditions of the schismatic Oriental Christians were shattered. Many former obstacles to a closer connexion between the Catholic and the schismatic Church are actually removed. Millions of Russian people are scattered throughout the world. In Russia proper Caesar-papalism, which enslaved the Church, is dead, while Russian Christianity is being purified in a severe crisis under the yoke of a godless Bolshevism. The Greek Constantinople patriarchate has lost its prestige. Rumanian, Bulgarian and Serbian schismatics are also in a crisis, looking for light from other directions.

In the past ten years the Catholic Church has given special attention to the Christian Orient. Benedict XV, in view of the great importance of the Oriental Church question, showed his personal solicitude for the Oriental Christians by founding in 1917 a special congregation "Pro Ecclesia Orientali". Oriental Church affairs were up to 1917 administered by the Propaganda, but now this new congregation has taken the work into its own hands. It follows, then, that among Catholics also special action should be taken to organize the work for the Christian Orient.

The Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith is aided by many pious Catholic confraternities. It will also be necessary for the Congregation "Pro Ecclesia Orientali" to be efficiently aided and remembered by Catholics in their prayers and almsdeeds, in popularizing the idea of a universal Church union and by scientific study of the whole Eastern Church question. All this is even now being preëminently done by the "Apostolate of Sts. Cyril and Methodius". For that reason it should be declared and acknowledged as the accepted organized medium of all Catholic action for the general union of the Churches.

The "Apostolate of Sts. Cyril and Methodius" is universal in its aims, international in work and organization and therefore quite capable of becoming universal in its extension. They are working in Europe in that direction. When P. M. d'Herbigny, president of the "Institutum Pontificium Orientale", notified the Holy Father that this year they had succeeded in founding in Paris, under the auspices of the "Apostolate of Sts. Cyril and Methodius" a "Cercle pour l'Union des Eglises", the Holy Father at once expressed his special personal satisfaction that the Apostolate had taken root in France.

During the International Eucharistic Congress at Chicago the idea of the "Apostolate of Sts. Cyril and Methodius" was presented to the American Catholics in the firm hope that the same American Catholics, who have such a deep understanding and appreciation for Catholic solidarity, will gladly join the great international action for the reunion of schismatic Oriental Churches and help to bring them back to the one unified Church. Thus all who believe in the Eucharistic Christ and with us venerate the Mother of Christ, may also tenderly love with us the one Holy Mother Church.

FRANCIS GRIVEC

Ljubljana, Jugoslavia.

THE TESTIMONY OF JOSEPHUS TO CHRIST.

IN view of the frequently renewed attacks upon Catholic dogma which profess to be made in the name of historical scholarship as well as of Science, it is always a satisfaction for the Christian apologist to be able to point out that the most uncompromising verdicts of experts in both fields of research are very far from being irreformable. An example in point has recently come to the surface in connexion with the Jewish historian Flavius Josephus and his alleged silence regarding the Founder of Christianity. Probably the wide publicity lately given to the matter by the English press was due to a misunderstanding, for as soon as the real position of affairs was explained, the interest in the topic at once fizzled out. But the short-lived excitement remains upon record and the story of how it came about is not without its lessons.

On 11 April of the present year, *The Observer* (London), which is the most literary, and normally the least sensational, of the English Sunday newspapers, appeared with some startling head-lines introducing an article by Professor G. H. Box, D.D., a well known Biblical scholar of King's College, London —"Jesus Christ in History"—"Important New Evidence"—"Fuller Version of Josephus"—"The New Law" etc. Next morning *The Times,* catching the infection, printed a fairly long notice in much the same strain and followed it up on Tuesday by an account of a conversation with the supposed discoverer, one Dr. Vacher Burch, who, it would appear, had not been very communicative. A rather deprecatory letter from this gentleman appeared a little later, but on the Saturday came two communications to *The Times* from Paris, one of them from Professor Solomon Reinach, and the other, which occupied more than a column of space, emanating from Dr. Robert Eisler, who claimed for himself the credit of the new light which, he averred, had been thrown upon the obscure problem of the reticence of Josephus. "Discovery", in the ordinary sense of the word, there had been none; though that term had been freely used both by Dr. Burch himself and in the press notices of his article. No new source, nor even any new text of sources already familiar, had come to light. A Slavonic version—it is usually so designated, though Dr. Eisler assures us that it is more correctly described as Old-Russian—of Josephus's *De Bello Judaico* has been known for centuries past, and there are several manuscript copies of it. In this Slavonic version are contained eight separate references to events connected with the life of our Lord which are entirely lacking in the ordinary Greek recension, written in that language, as no one has ever doubted, by Josephus himself. Twenty years ago a German translation of all these eight Slavonic passages with a full discussion of the question of their authenticity was printed in Harnack's famous series of *Texte und Untersuchungen.* The author of this substantial essay, the late Dr. A. Berendts, contended that the passages as they stood might be accepted as the genuine work of Josephus, but Professor Schürer and others argued so strongly against this conclusion that little further attention was paid to the Slavonic version. It is mentioned indeed by Jackson and Lake in their book *The Begin-*

nings of Christianity, by H. St. John Thackeray in his *Selections from Josephus,* by Couchoud in his *Mystère de Jésus,* and by several others, but the general attitude of Western scholars has been to treat the Slavonic version as so obviously interpolated as to be undeserving of serious discussion.

To this lack of interest we must undoubtedly attribute the fact that a resuscitation of the neglected Slavonic testimonies could have been regarded even for a few days as an important new discovery. It came about, I take it, in this way. The Anglican diocese of Liverpool, which, since the opening of its new cathedral, seems to have been fired with an ambition to live up to these architectural glories, has recently started a magazine of its own, *The Diocese of Liverpool Review.* In the laudable desire of booming its first issue (dated April 1926) the editor commissioned Dr. Vacher Burch, already mentioned, to contribute a series of articles about the Slavonic Josephus under the title "A Remarkable Discovery concerning Jesus Christ", a heading which is further emphasized by a preliminary note in the following terms:

> We ask our readers' special attention to Dr. Burch's article in this number. Dr. Burch's discoveries are, we believe, of epoch-making importance in the early history of Christianity. A fuller account, with translations of the Slavonic MSS., is shortly to be published in book form.

A copy of this first number was presumably sent to Professor Box, who is also an Anglican clergyman and Honorary Canon of St. Alban's, and he, no doubt with the best intentions, gave the "discovery" a very enthusiastic puff in the columns of *The Observer.* His long article quotes Dr. Burch to the effect that "a pile of manuscripts was found written in the ancient church language of the Slavs", and clearly implies that it was only the unsettled post-war conditions which had interfered with their immediate communication to an expectant world. Then *The Times* chimed in upon the same note, but happily elicited from Dr. Eisler the long letter which has saved us from a fiasco analogous to that caused by the alleged discovery of the missing books of Livy which is still fresh in our memories.[1]

[1] How strongly Dr. Burch emphasizes this idea of a discovery of fresh

While, however, we must recognize that no lost treasure has recently been recovered and nothing brought to light which was not known before, the question of Josephus's testimony to Christianity has undoubtedly passed of late into an entirely new phase. Twenty years ago not a few distinguished Catholics (e. g. Lagrange, Batiffol, Lesêtre, Bardenhewer, etc.), and nearly all non-Catholic scholars, were content to dismiss unceremoniously as a later interpolation the famous passage in which the Jewish historian in his *Antiquities* (XVIII, iii, 3) speaks of the person of our Lord, mentions His condemnation to the death of the Cross by Pilate and seems to accept the fact of His resurrection on the third day. It is admitted that this passage is found in all the known manuscripts of the *Antiquities,* which we only possess in a Greek text, and that it is quoted early in the fourth century by Eusebius and a little later by St. Jerome and others. But so completely was this testimony surrendered by the majority of scholars that Mgr. Batiffol, in his lectures "On the Credibility of the Gospel", (1910), in which he replied to M. Solomon Reinach's notorious *Orpheus,* devoted his first address to "The Silence of Josephus", in other words he set out to explain to his hearers exactly why it was that the Jewish historian when dealing with Jerusalem at this very period had said nothing at all about Jesus Christ or His teaching.[2] And here it will be well to quote the text of the famous passage which for more than three centuries has been the subject of so much controversy:

Now about this time came Jesus, a wise man, if indeed one may call him a man, for he was a doer of wonderful works, a teacher of such men as receive what is true with pleasure, and he attracted many Jews and many of the Greeks: this was "the Christ". And when, on the accusation of the principal men among us, Pilate had condemned him to the cross, they did not desist who had formerly loved him (for he appeared to them on the third day alive again,

material may be seen from the following passage in his article: "The problem of Josephus, and also of the hope of new evidence for Jesus Christ, would have remained just there, if that brilliantly ironical disturber of settled opinions, Discovery [with a capital D], had not disclosed new treasures of knowledge." *Diocese of Liverpool Review,* No. 1, p. 27.

[2] It may be of interest to remark that Mgr. Batiffol, writing in 1910, calls attention in a footnote (Eng. Trans., p. 17) to the Christ passages in the Slavonic text.

the divine prophets having foretold both this and a myriad other wonderful things about him) and even now the race of those called "Christians" after him has not died out.[3]

Of this testimony Mr. G. R. S. Mead, whom I quote amid a score of similarly contemptuous critics for a reason which will appear further on, wrote in 1903:

It is true that we have the famous passage in the "*Antiquities*" of Josephus (XVIII, iii, 3) which amply and doctrinally confirms the Gospel tradition, but how so transparent a forgery could have escaped detection in even the most uncritical age is a marvel. For many years it has been abandoned by all schools of criticism, even the most conservative, and we have only to turn to any modern translation or text to find it definitely characterized as an interpolation or enclosed in brackets.

The same writer adds that "we are confronted with upwards of a dozen most potent arguments against its authenticity", and also that "if there be anything certain in the whole field of criticism, it is that this passage was never written by Josephus".[4] Though others who share the same view do not use quite such scornful language, there can be no doubt as to the definiteness of their verdict. Not only Niese who edited the standard edition of the complete Greek text of Josephus in seven volumes, and Schürer, who was reputed the highest authority on Jewish history, but a multitude of other specialists like Professors Margoliouth of Oxford, Solomon Reinach of Paris, Norden, etc.—it would be useless to make a catalogue—describe this testimony unequivocally as a Christian interpolation. I do not propose to discuss the arguments appealed to in the controversy[5] since it would be necessary for this purpose to have the Greek text before us; but it will be sufficient for my present object to point out that within the last few years, by a very remarkable revulsion of critical opinion, the credit of the disputed passage has in large measure

[3] I have adopted here the translation given by Professor Burkitt in the epoch-making article which he contributed in 1913 to the *Theologisch Tijdschrift*, Vol. xlvii, p. 137.

[4] *Did Jesus Live 100 B. C.?* by G. R. S. Mead (1903), p. 60.

[5] An admirable summary of the question by A. Tricot will be found in two numbers of the *Revue Apologétique* for April 15 and May 1, 1922. It may be pointed out that here again the existence-of-the-Christ passages in the Slavonic *De Bello Judaico* is duly called attention to (p. 152, note).

been rehabilitated. The influence which has been most potent in bringing about this change of feeling seems to have been that of Professor Burkitt of Cambridge University. His reasoning not only gained over a number of English scholars like the late Professor Sanday of Oxford, and the Hulsean Professor of Divinity at Cambridge, W. E. Barnes, but also prevailed with the most eminent and influential of Lutheran teachers in Germany, Professor Adolf Harnack. In 1897 Harnack referred to Josephus's testimony to Christ as "a spurious interpolation";[6] in 1913, after the publication of Burkitt's vindication, the German professor came round to the view that "a decision in favor of its genuineness may be arrived at with a high degree of probability".[7] There have, of course, been reclamations, but the tide of adverse opinion has undoubtedly turned. In the most recent study of Josephus's work, which I have had the opportunity of examining (Richard Laqueur, *Der judische Historiker Flavius Josephus,* Giessen, 1920), the authenticity of the Christus passage is stoutly maintained. Perhaps no clearer illustration of the change of feeling can be produced than that supplied by the article "Josephus" in Hastings' *Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics* (Vol. VII, pp. 569-579). This volume was published in 1914 before the war, and the article in question had been written by Professor B. Niese, the editor of the standard critical text of Josephus. True to his previously published opinions Niese declared that "the general consensus of investigators has long ago decided that the passage (referring to Jesus Christ) is spurious". Niese, however, had died before the article was printed, and in passing it through the press Dr. Louis H. Gray of Columbia University, New York, assistant editor of the Encyclopedia, thought it desirable to supplement the text by a lengthy excursus on this particular point. There, after reviewing the recent articles of Burkitt, Harnack and Barnes, Dr. Gray finally reaches the conclusion that "the difficulties in the way of the hypothesis of Christian forgery are far greater than those which beset the theory that the passage is genuine".

[6] *Chronologie d'alt-Christ. Literatur bis Eusebius,* p. 581.

[7] Harnack in the *Internationale Monatschrift für Wissenschaft* &c. (1913), VII, pp. 1037-1068.

We are justified, then, in believing that Flavius Josephus, Jew as he was, did take an interest in the life of Christ our Lord and that he went so far as to present the matter, albeit a little patronizingly, almost from the point of view of the Christian believer. In the *Antiquities* he was writing in Greek for educated readers, for the most part not Jews, and he was so far removed from any extreme conservatism that he did not scruple to hail Vespasian as the Messiah of prophecy; which surely proves that he was in no small degree indifferent to the good will of the mass of his countrymen. I can myself see no difficulty in believing that, living in Rome, Josephus may have been on terms of tolerant sympathy, if not of friendship, with some of his own nation who had become Christians. He had himself departed almost as far from the traditions of strict Jewish orthodoxy as any Christian convert had done. There is every reason to believe that the ordinary Roman of average education who had heard anything at all about the people called Christians, looked upon them merely as a Jewish sect; and it is quite conceivable that, though Josephus himself felt no inclination to become a disciple, the ties of race in his land of exile may have induced him to give a favorable presentment of the teacher from whom they derived their law and their name.

The *Antiquitates Judaicae* of Josephus, in which appears the Christus passage just commented upon, was written in Greek by the author after he had taken up his residence in Rome. It was only finished in A. D. 94. His other important historical work, the *De Bello Judaico,* was earlier in date and took shape under different circumstances. As Josephus himself tells us in the preface to the Greek edition he had first written an account of the Romano-Jewish wars, in the popular speech of Palestine, the Aramaic, for the instruction of the Parthians, and Babylonians and the people of the Jewish race settled about the Euphrates and even as far off as Arabia. He does not precisely assert that he translated this first narrative of his into Greek, but only that it seemed to him a shame that, while the "barbarians" were thus well informed, the citizens of the Roman empire should be left in the dark as to the true facts of the case. For this reason he had now told the story again in a form which would render it accessible to the people of the

West. So far as there has been any "discovery" in connexion with the Slavonic version of the *De Bello Judaico,* the discovery amounts simply to this that it has occurred to certain critics that the Slavonic text may be a translation, not of the Greek, but of the Aramaic original draft, with regard to the contents of which we know nothing whatever. This idea had already been suggested by Dr. Berendts in 1906,[8] and Dr. Eisler avers that he himself is now in a position to prove it,[9] but so far no shadow of anything which can be called a demonstration has been adduced in its favor. All that we can say is that the Slavonic and Greek texts seem nowhere to agree very closely, and that the former certainly contains passages which have nothing corresponding to them in the *De Bello Judaico* as hitherto known to us.

In the view of Berendts all that we now find in the Slavonic version reproduces the authentic text of Josephus himself, apart from such accidental modifications as are bound to occur in a possibly rather loose translation from one language to another; and this also seems to be the opinion of Dr. Burch. Dr. Eisler, on the other hand, while attributing to Josephus the substance of the eight relevant passages, considers that in some of them Christian interpolations have been introduced by the translator or transcribers. With the first three passages, which refer to the preaching and death of St. John the Baptist, we need not now concern ourselves. The three which are of special interest are the fourth, fifth, and seventh. Of the fourth I propose to give a rendering here, using for the purpose the German versions of Berendts and of Frey. The clauses which Dr. Eisler considers to have been Christian interpolations or falsifications I enclose in square brackets:

At that time came a man, if one may call him a man, in as much as his nature and his bodily frame were those of a man but his revelation of himself betrayed something more than human. [His doings in fact were godlike, and he wrought marvels, wonderful and mighty works; wherefore it is not possible to describe him as a man.] Neither, if all things are considered, should I call him an angel, [for all that he did in virtue of some invisible power, he effected by

[8] See Berendts' *Die Zeugnisse vom Christentum im slavischen "De Bello Judaico" des Josephus,* pp. 70 seq.

[9] Eisler in *The Quest,* Oct. 1925.

his word and command]. Some said of him that our first lawgiver (Moses) had risen from the dead and was manifesting his prowess by crafts and bodily cures. Others were of opinion that he was the promised envoy of God. But he set himself in opposition to the Law in many things and did not keep the Sabbath according to the usage of our fathers. Nevertheless he did no evil, nor committed any offence, and by his word he effected everything; and many of the people followed him and lent ear to his teaching. Thus many souls became unsettled, thinking that through this his teaching the Jewish tribes might free themselves from the sway of the Romans.

Now it was his custom to take up his station outside the city on the Mount of Olives. There it was that he manifested to the people his works of healing, and so there gathered round him of disciples ("slaves") a hundred and fifty, and of the populace a crowd.

When they saw his power and that he could by his word do all that he would, they urged him to enter the city and to destroy the Roman soldiers and Pilate and to take the government into his own hands. [But he treated such words with contempt.]

Afterward when the news of this was brought to the leaders of the Jews, they held a meeting, together with the High Priest, and said: "We are powerless and too weak to withstand the Romans; and seeing that the bow is bent, we will go and inform Pilate of what we have learnt, thus making ourselves secure, lest, if he hear of this from others, we may have our possessions confiscated and ourselves be put to the sword and the children of Israel be dispersed". And they went in and told Pilate, and he sent and caused many of the people to be massacred, and he had the worker of marvels arrested and brought before him. But when he had put him on his trial [he perceived that he was a doer of good and not of evil, not a teacher of sedition nor a man ambitious of sovereignty, and he set him free; for he had healed his dying wife. And he went back to his accustomed station and performed the works that he did before. And whereas still more people thronged around him, so did he win glory more than ever through the marvels which he wrought. But the teachers of the Law had their minds poisoned with envy and they gave thirty talents to Pilate to put him to death. And he, after taking the money allowed them to execute their purpose themselves], and they crucified him, [contravening] [10] the Law of their fathers.

In the fifth passage we have a brief account of what happened to the early Christians under the Roman governor Cuspius Fadus and Tiberius Alexander, who are represented

[10] Dr. Eisler contends that this in the original must have been "*according* to ancestral custom".

as ruling Jerusalem simultaneously. This is certainly incorrect, for the brief administration of Cuspius preceded that of Tiberius Alexander. They are described as successfully maintaining order by enforcing with rigor the observance of the Jewish Law, and punishing those who were denounced to them as offenders against it. In this way, about A. D. 41, a number of Christian converts were brought to their notice.

> Many [we are told] were discovered to be disciples of the wonder-worker above described, and as they spoke to the people of their Master, alleging that he was alive, although he had been put to death, and that he could set them free from bondage, many of the populace harkened to the aforesaid disciples and adopted their Law. Neither was this due to human respect, for they (the disciples) were people of the humbler sort, some cobblers, some sandal-makers, others artisans. [And yet what astounding wonders they performed — in truth whatever they chose to do—and this not to gain glory for themselves.]

The account goes on to say that, while the Roman governors desired to abstain from interference on the ground that though "in the ordinary course of nature such signs did not happen", still the movement would die a natural death unless it were the work of God, nevertheless the Scribes were so persistent in their remonstrances that they received authority to punish the converts as they pleased.

The sixth passage speaks briefly of an inscription in the temple which, it was averred, stated in obvious refutation of Pilate's writing on the cross that "Jesus had not ruled as King, but that he had been crucified by the Jews because he proclaimed the destruction of the city and the devastation of the temple".

Lastly we may notice that in the seventh insertion Josephus, or his interpolator, professes to describe the pitiably ragged condition of the veil of the temple which had been torn from the top to the bottom "after the Jews by bribery had brought to execution their benefactor, the man who by his deeds was no man", and thereupon the Slavonic text remarks:

> And of many other frightful portents might we speak which occurred at that time. It was said that after he was dead and even buried he was not found in the tomb. Some give out that he is risen,

others that he has been stolen by his friends. I, however, cannot decide which speak more correctly. For a dead man cannot rise of himself, though he might do so by the prayers of another just man, unless indeed he were an angel, some one of the heavenly Powers, or unless God himself appears as a man and accomplishes what he wills, sojourning with men, falls, lays himself down and rises again according to his pleasure. But others again said that it was not possible to steal him, because they had set guards around the tomb—thirty Romans and as many as a thousand Jews.

Obviously there is much in these passages to arouse suspicion, and even Dr. Eisler who, partly on linguistic grounds, defends the Slavonic text as being in substance undeniably a translation of Josephus's Aramaic original, insists that the Christian interpolator has been busy in the sections just quoted. Meanwhile it is interesting to note that Dr. Eisler's thesis has been very favorably received by such non-Christian or rationalistic savants as Professor Solomon Reinach and Lehmann-Haupt. This much alone is sufficient to drive a last nail into the coffin of the Jesus myth of Dr. Couchoud and other opponents of the historicity of the Gospels, and it may be remarked, at least as an indication of the set of the tide, that Mr. G. R. S. Mead, who twenty years ago was intent on proving that Christ lived about 100 B. C., is now one of the most enthusiastic of Dr. Eisler's supporters. One thing, however, is certain, and that is that before any final conclusion can be arrived at, the whole of the Slavonic text has to be printed and carefully compared with the Greek *De Bello Judaico*. Until then, all talk of a "great discovery" must be premature, and it is hardly too much to call it even ridiculous.

London, England. HERBERT THURSTON, S.J.

WHEN DID CHRIST'S PASSION BEGIN?

THE question may also be put in this way: When did Christ's Sacrifice begin? "For", to cite once more, the well-worn saying of St. Cyprian, "The Passion of the Lord is the Sacrifice that we offer." We mean by the Passion, then, the sufferings that constitute Christ's Sacrifice. And so we exclude the sufferings of His childhood, and the sufferings of His manhood up to the point when He made the sacrificial

offering of His life for the sins of the world. Before then, indeed, His sufferings were meritorious, but not by way of sacrifice. It was the ritual offering of them to God the Father that constituted them a sacrifice. And so the Passion of Christ is a sacrifice in so far, and only in so far, as He offered in sacrifice the sufferings that went to make it up.

Of the sufferings that made up the Passion, some were of the body, which St. Thomas calls "exterior", and some of the soul which he calls "interior".[1] Great as were our Lord's bodily sufferings, His mental sufferings appear to have been even greater. And greatest of these were, beyond all question, the agony in the garden, when His soul was sorrowful even unto death, and the dereliction on the Cross which wrung from His lips the cry, "My God, my God, why hast Thou forsaken me". The agony was as much part of the Passion of Christ as was the dereliction. It was included in the sacrificial offering of His life which he made to God the Father in the Supper; for the main cause of the agony was the absolute inevitableness of the cruel torments which He had pledged Himself to undergo and with which He was now face to face.

Some have thought that our Lord was offering His Sacrifice from the moment that He came into the world, so understanding the words: "Sacrifice and oblation Thou wouldst not, but a body Thou hast fitted unto me. Lo, I am come, etc." But this view overlooks two things, (1) that the offering of sacrifice is always accompanied by an outward rite or ceremony, and (2) that Christ is Priest according to the order of Melchisedech, and so had to offer His Sacrifice according to the rite of Melchisedech. This He did in the Supper, and only in the Supper. He did it once, as St. Paul repeatedly tells us, and as we can see for ourselves. It is repugnant to reason that He should have offered His Sacrifice twice. In the Supper He became the Victim designate for the sins of the world, and from that moment all His sufferings, both mental and bodily, became part of the Sacrifice of our Ransom—part of the Passion of the Lord which is the Sacrifice that we offer.

Christ's Sacrifice is the Sin Offering of the New Testament. Now, He Himself declares in set terms that the offering in the Supper is His Sin Offering—"My blood which is shed (or

[1] 3ª, q. 46, a. 6.

will be shed) for many unto remission of sins." Whether you follow the original Greek or the Vulgate, plain it is that here we have Christ's offering for sin. According to the Greek, the blood is shed now, which it is, sacrificially, as soon as it is offered; even as Christ Himself is ritually dead from the moment when He gives Himself up to death in the Supper. So, St. Gregory of Nyssa reckons the triduum of Christ's death from the evening of Holy Thursday, when Christ offered Himself in the Supper, till Easter morn—two whole days and well into the third, according to the Jewish ritual. But will any one say that Christ's Sin Offering was complete till His Blood was actually shed?

If there is one thing absolutely certain in the matter we are dealing with, it is this: We are offering in the Mass what our Lord first offered in the Supper. We are doing what He did and bade us do. Now, the Passion of the Lord is the Sacrifice that we offer, according to the ancient tradition of the Church, as voiced by St. Cyprian. Therefore the Passion is the Sacrifice that our Lord offered in the Supper. Again, the Sacrifice of our Ransom is the Sacrifice that we offer in the Mass, according to the constant tradition of the Church, as attested by St. Augustine. Therefore, it was the Sacrifice of our Ransom that our Lord offered in the Supper. Once more, it is the Sacrifice consummated on the Cross that we are offering in the Mass, according to the age-long tradition of the Church, as officially proclaimed by Leo XIII in an Encyclical Letter (*Caritatis Studium,* 25 July, 1888). Therefore it was the Sacrifice consummated on the Cross that our Lord offered in the Supper. Finally the belief of the Church from the beginning, as made vocal in all our catechisms and simple manuals of instruction, is that the Sacrifice which we offer in the Mass is one and the same with the Sacrifice of Calvary—not a new sacrifice, but the self-same continued: that the Mass is thus the continuation of the Sacrifice of Calvary. Therefore what our Lord offered in the Supper was not another sacrifice but the self-same that was consummated on the Cross. This surely ought to clinch the matter. One who should deny the liturgical connexion between the Supper and the Cross, in the face of this, would hardly be keeping within the lines of Catholic truth.

It has been maintained of late that St. Thomas separates the Supper from the Cross, and makes the Cross the Sacrifice of our Redemption out of all liturgical relation to the Supper.[2] But this is to do the Angel of the Schools a grave injustice. After St. Paul and St. Augustine, he, perhaps, more than any one else rings the changes on the oneness of Christ's Sacrifice. He always speaks of the "Sacrifice of Christ," and knows of one only. He says that "the Sacrifice which is offered daily in the Church is not other than the Sacrifice which Christ Himself offered, but is the commemoration of it".[3] This means that the Mass is the commemoration of the Sacrifice of Calvary and one with that which it commemorates—"the shadow of Calvary", as Manning so aptly expresses it, "but also the reality". He repeats this in his commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews (9:12), and adds words which enable us to see clearly that he believed Christ made the offering of His Sacrifice in the Supper. The whole passage will be found at page 96 of my book on the Mass. I cite here the relevant part: "And if it be objected to this that we offer daily, I reply that we do not offer other than that which Christ offered for us, viz. His Blood. Hence ours is not another Sacrifice, but is the commemoration of that Sacrifice which Christ offered, as we read in Luke 22:19: This do for a commemoration of me." Note the reference to Luke and the words cited. According to St. Thomas, "that Sacrifice which Christ offered", than which the Mass "is not other", is the "One Sacrifice" by which He "cleansed forever them that are sanctified", as is affirmed in the lines immediately preceding those that are here cited. When did our Lord offer this One Sacrifice, according to the Saint? In the Supper, for it was in the Supper that our Lord uttered the words on which the Saint founds his assertion that "ours is not another Sacrifice, to wit, "This do for a commemoration of Me". And it was in the Supper, as I have pointed out, that Christ consecrated and offered the Blood of His One Sacrifice for sin. Therefore, according to St. Thomas, "that Sacrifice which Christ offered" He was offering in the Supper at the moment when He uttered these words, and the Sacrifice offered in the Supper was the Sacri-

[2] *The Last Supper and Calvary,* by Rev. Alfred Swaby, O.P.

[3] 3ª, q. 22, a. 3, ad 2um.

fice by which Christ "cleansed forever them that are sanctified", viz. the Sacrifice of Calvary. This shows how foreign to the mind of St. Thomas is the notion that there was no liturgical connexion between the Supper and the Cross. According to those who separate the Supper from the Cross and make the Supper by itself a sacrifice, the Mass, as the continuation of the Supper, may indeed be commemorative of the Sacrifice of Calvary, but is "other than" it. According to St. Thomas, the Mass, as the continuation of the Sacrifice offered by Christ in the Supper, is commemorative of the Sacrifice of Calvary and "not another Sacrifice".

It is claimed that St. Thomas makes the Passion begin in the garden with Judas's betrayal of the Master. But this is to lose sight of the distinction drawn by the Saint between the "exterior" element of the Passion and the "interior", and to give a wholly inadequate view of his teaching on the subject. The Passion *as inflicted* began in the garden; the Passion *as assumed* began in the cenacle. This was the *oblation* of the Victim, that, the *mactation,* on the part of Christ who offered Himself an *immolation.*

St. Thomas distinguishes between what he calls "the Passion itself", i. e. Christ's mental and bodily sufferings, and Christ's Sacrifice for sin. What he calls "the Passion itself" is the material element of the Sacrifice, which has to be joined with Christ's own offering of it, as the formal element, to constitute the Sacrifice of our Redemption. As the foundation is to the building, and the roots of the tree are to the trunk and branches, so was the offering that Christ made of Himself in the Supper to the Passion that followed. It was the offering that formally constituted His Sacrifice.

The Mass is both the representation and the re-presentation of the Passion of Christ which is the Sacrifice that we offer. St. Thomas calls it, in the first sense, *imago quaedam representativa passionis Christi.* In explaining how the repeated signs of the cross that are made in the Mass represent what took place in the great Sacrifice of the New Law, he distinguishes several stages of the Passion.[4] He says that "the priest uses the sign of the cross in the celebration of the Mass to symbolize the Passion of Christ which terminated on the

[4] 3ª, q. 83, a. 5, ad 3um.

Cross". Here he is speaking of the Passion in the formal sense, as including the ritual offering in the Supper; for it is in this sense precisely that the Mass represents it, and what is done in the Mass symbolizes it. Now, he says, "the Passion of Christ was gone through with by certain stages". And the first stage he sets down is "Christi traditio, quae facta est a Deo, Juda, et Judaeis", that is to say, "the delivering up of Christ which was the work of God, Judas, and the Jews." The word "traditio" is here properly rendered "delivering up", rather than "betrayal", as well because "proditio" is the Latin for that, as especially because God did not betray Christ though He certainly delivered Him up. "Here", we are told, "God's share in the Passion, the work of God, dates from eternity, and therefore certainly was not in any sense ipsa Passio"—the passion itself. St. Thomas is considering the Passion as constituting the Sacrifice that is represented and reproduced in the Mass, and so, in the first stage, lays bare the roots of it. One root was in eternity, it is true—the decree of God. But that did not reveal itself directly on the stage of this world. Nor did it belong to the Sacrifice of Christ as such. What did belong to it, however, and formally constitute it, was the action of Christ, who is God, in giving Himself over, on the eve of His Passion, to the death of the Cross. To Him all power is given in Heaven and on earth; to Him belongs the work of our redemption by personal execution; by Him is offered in the Supper the Sacrifice of our Redemption. As soon as that offering is made, the other factors in the delivering up of Christ, the insatiable greed of Judas and the unrelenting hatred of the Jews, are set in motion. Christ Himself bids the disciple whose soul is fixed in the resolve to betray the Master, "What thou doest, do quickly"; and so, quickly, the way is opened to the second act in the Drama of our Redemption, the sale of Jesus Christ to the Jews by Judas for thirty pieces of silver. This, according to St. Thomas, (loc. cit.) is the second stage of the Passion, the second step in the offering and immolation of the Victim of Calvary.

One word in conclusion about a point already touched upon. The one thing wanting to every pang that our Lord endured from His coming into the world to His reclining at table with the Twelve being part of His Passion, part of the Sacrifice

which He offered in the Supper and we offer evermore in the Mass, was just the ritual offering made in the Supper. He was Priest according to the order of Melchisedech from the day of His coming into the world, but not from the day of His coming into the world did He offer His Sacrifice according to the rite of Melchisedech—not till *His hour was come.* Those who think that our Lord began to offer His Sacrifice as soon as He became man would make His Passion begin at the same time. Theological speculation, not tradition, is back of that idea. One school of theologians favored it both before and after the Council of Trent. If I mistake not, Lainez belonged to that school, and so found a propitiatory sacrifice in every act of Christ, or rather one propitiatory sacrifice in all that the Man of Sorrows did and suffered till He expired on the Cross.

For the rest, those who think that the internal act of offering, without any outward rite or ceremony, suffices for sacrifice, cannot choose but hold that our Lord began to offer His Sacrifice immediately on coming into the world, and that His Passion is coincident and coextensive with all His earthly sufferings. His Sacrifice would thus begin in Nazareth, or at any rate in Bethlehem, and end on Calvary. But what in this view of the offering in the Supper? And what of the teaching of the Epistle to the Hebrews that He offered Himself "once", and was offered "once" and "by one oblation perfected forever them that are sanctified"? The point is of so great moment that it will be well to labor it. Suppose the internal act of our Lord's will at the moment of the Incarnation was the formal constituent of His Sacrifice for sin, then all the sufferings of His life on earth up to the instant of His death on the Cross were part of that Sacrifice. They would constitute what is known as the Sacrifice of Calvary, which would stand wholly apart from and independent of the Sacrifice offered in the Supper. There would thus be two sacrifices of the New Law, and the Mass would be the continuation of the one offered in the Supper, not the continuation of the Sacrifice of Calvary. But St. Paul emphatically affirms that Christ "by one oblation perfected forever them that are sanctified." And Pope Leo XIII, voicing the immemorial tradition of the Church, teaches that "long before Christ was born

the Sacrifice of the Old Law shadowed forth the Sacrifice of the Cross", and that "after His Ascension into heaven that identical Sacrifice is offered in the Mass".

There is no foundation in Scripture, nor in Tradition, nor *in sensu fidelium,* nor *in sensu communi humani generis,* for the notion that sacrifice, in the strict and proper sense of the word, can be offered without outward rite or ceremony.

RT. REV. ALEX. MACDONALD.

FATHER JOHN MacENERY, PIONEER IN PALEONTOLOGY.

SOME ten years ago I wrote for the ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW sketches of the lives of Abbé Breuil and Father Hugo Obermaier, to whom much is owed for the development of paleontology which in recent years has probably attracted more popular attention than any other science related to biology. These priests, one French and the other German, are now recognized throughout the scientific world as two of the most important contributors to our knowledge of the cave man and of the various remains associated with him which have been the subject of study in recent years. They have familiarized people generally with the idea that man is much older on the earth than used to be thought, and that he was undoubtedly contemporary with the hairy mammoth, the sabre-toothed tiger, and other animals which have been long extinct and which were commonly thought to have disappeared from the earth long before the coming of man. The study of fossils, as unearthed in the caves of the Dordogne in France and in northern Spain, has put this quite beyond all doubt in our day.

Their researches have made it very clear that at a time when the reindeer inhabited southwestern France and northern Spain, that is when these countries were as cold as are now Siberia or Alaska, when the ice age was just passing away in southern Europe and even along the Mediterranean, man was not only in existence there but had reached a certain rather high level of culture. For as the result of the explorations of a number of his cave dwellings it has been found that he decorated all the implements that he handled with what are

now recognized as really artistic even though somewhat primitive engravings. The cave man made drinking cups of the horns of animals and spoons from pieces of flat horn and sharpened bones for use as pins to keep the skins of the animals in which he clothed himself together and in every instance he labored to make these utensils and implements beautiful as well as useful. Not only that, but the cave man made pictures on the walls of his cave home, as if he were intent on making it beautiful, or perhaps with a religious idea in his mind; for it seems clear that these paintings were in a certain way votive offerings by which he hoped to obtain the favor of the Great Spirit in his contests with the animals. He painted back in the dark of his cave where only the Great Spirit could see them well. These pictures are primitive in their art quality, but they are vivid and vigorous and it has been said that there is no animal painter alive to-day who could excel them as reproductions of the life of the animals, both at rest and in motion, as the cave man saw them.

It is very evident that the cave man who was the contemporary of these extinct animals was as far from the beasts as we are ourselves, for he was undoubtedly an artist and an artist is the flower of our civilization. Besides being an artist, however, the cave man was also an inventor, for after making various ingenious implements and weapons which the esthetic urge in him compelled him to try to make beautiful also, he invented oil painting in order to make his wall pictures. He manifestly knew colors very well because he took the colors of the lower end of the spectrum, the reds and the yellows and the browns, for which men are so frequently color blind or of impaired vision, and he reproduced them with a fidelity equal to that of the artists of our day or any other period. In order to do this he had to find among the minerals colors adapted for the purpose. When found they proved to be insoluble in water. He ground them fine in a mortar—some of the mortars are still extant—and mixing them with the rendered fat of the animals, he used the oil colors thus obtained in painting in oil on his cave-home walls. That is why these paintings have been preserved for us until our day.

Almost needless to say the man who invented oil painting so long ago and who painted these pictures of animals is an

ancestor worthy of the race at its best. Instead of being just a little above the beasts, so that he was capable of expelling the other animals from their caves on the hillsides and then dragging his wife home by the hair of the head to bear his burdens and his children, according to the conventional story of the cave man as it is popularly accepted, he was a man like ourselves except that he was not so sophisticated. As a matter of fact the personal remains of him that have been found indicate that he was a little taller and a little broader shouldered than are the men of those same regions in France and Spain at the present time, and that he had very probably also a little larger skull than the average of humanity at the present day. There are a number of indications moreover that he was very like the men of those regions in our own day, only that his open-air life and his vigorous activities of existence gave him a bodily development above that of the present day. The result of the labors of these two priests has been to give us a very satisfactory picture of this oldest man that we know anything definite about.

The surprise to a great many people has been that two priests should have been so prominent in the scientific researches that have brought us all this valuable knowledge. There are a great many people who assume that the Church has been so opposed to the gathering of information of this kind that surely priests would have been hampered in the work or probably interdicted entirely from its continuance. The Church is supposed to have been bitterly opposed to the development and diffusion of ideas with regard to man's origin tens of thousands of years ago and to look with an eye of stern suspicion on scientific developments that might seem to indicate that man was already in existence when many of the extinct species of animals which have disappeared long since were on the earth.

This story of the development of our knowledge of the cave man however is a striking contradiction of any such notions as these and the fact remains that both of these priests are not only in good standing but looked up to as very faithful ecclesiastics whose work is conferring distinction not only on themselves but on the Church. They represent the culmination of our knowledge of pre-historic man, but recent developments in

the history of science have brought out the fact that the first important pioneer work in this branch of science which has eventually shown us man in existence so long ago, came from another priest.

Almost needless to say, it took a long while for men to accept the idea that man existed so long before history as we know it began, and as a result the first scientific observers to suggest this thought were looked at rather askance. One had to be a rather hardy explorer and undisturbed by contemptuous looks to take up and still more continue the work. It is a matter for no little pardonable pride then that the very earliest worker in human paleontology was a young Irish priest, the chaplain of an old English family living in the south of England in the Abbey of Tor in South Devon. He was very much taken with the idea of exploring certain caves in the neighborhood where he lived and in the course of these explorations he found remains at least of man's handiwork, especially flints of various kinds that had been shaped for one purpose or another, among the bones of extinct animals. No one was willing to accept his conclusions that such finds constituted a demonstration that man and these animals were contemporary, though the explorer consulted the men of science who were most distinguished in this field at that time. Nevertheless, far from being discouraged, he continued his researches at no inconsiderable personal danger and with risks to his health which eventually shortened his life. His investigations were made so carefully and his finds so well arranged and distributed to a number of museums that no wonder his name is forever attached to the foundation of this branch of science.

This distinction for the young priest is acknowledged by all those who are familiar with the history of their science. Sir Arthur Keith, the eminent British anthropologist, knighted for his contributions to the sciences related to man, in an article in the New York Times Sunday Magazine (25 April, 1926), called attention to the fact that just a century and a year ago in 1825 the Reverend John MacEnery, a young Catholic priest, not yet thirty years of age, "turned the searchlight of science upon man's remote and buried past". Father John MacEnery was the chaplain of the Carey family who in spite of persecutions in England had remained faithful to the Church

and who at this time occupied Tor Abbey along the coast of Devon. Cave hunting as it was called, that is searching through caves for various remains that might be found in them, was just beginning to be a fad at the time and not far from Tor Abbey was the famous Kent's Hole in which a large number of specimens of various kinds, fossil bones, remains of many different kinds of animals which up to that time had not been supposed to have ever existed in England, were found. Father MacEnery caught the craze, but instead of following it merely as a fad for a time he took it up as a very serious avocation in life and as the result of his researches it became more and more clear that man must have existed at the same time that a number of these long extinct animals did.

Father Kevin Clark, O.P., in a series of articles in the October, November and December 1925 numbers of *Blackfriars,* the magazine of the Dominican Fathers published in London, gave some account of the work of Father MacEnery. The beginning of it which at the time seemed rather unpromising is best told in the good priest's own words which fortunately are preserved for us in some manuscripts of his that are now in the Torquay Museum of which a copy was printed in the *Transactions of the Devonshire Association* (1869). The passage makes it easy to understand some of the romance of cave hunting and the finding of the buried treasures of paleontology—though neither the word nor the science were yet in existence—that entered into the soul of Father MacEnery when he found his first specimens. Looking for the buried treasure of pirates has an allurement all its own, but manifestly it is not more than that of buried scientific data which may be brought to light. Father MacEnery recounts his personal experience as follows:

"Having one morning in the summer of 1825 chanced to hear a friend express his intention to join an exploration party (to Kent's Cavern) I was induced to accompany him. We found his relation, Mr. Northmore, who had already been investigating the cavern, at its entrance, surrounded by about a dozen persons, among whom were remarked the Commander of the coastguard and his men. All were busy in equipping themselves for their expedition underground.

"The passage being too narrow to admit more than one person at a time (and that in a stooping position), the company entered in files, each bearing a light in one hand and a pickaxe in the other, headed by a guide, carrying a lantern before the chief of the band. I made the last of the train, for I could not divest myself of certain undefinable sensations, it being my first visit to a scene of this nature."

The rest of the party were not very successful in their search for specimens. The reason, as Father MacEnery very soon discovered, was that they were devoting themselves to merely superficial excavation and specimens were not to be found so close to the surface as they presumed. He withdrew from the party then and picking out what he thought would be a suitable spot he dug deeper than the others and was rewarded by finding some specimens of teeth and the promise of still other bones if he should only dig deeper. His feelings on thus finding for the first time the remains of very ancient animals must be left to his own description which fortunately has come down to us. He wrote a sketch called *Teeth and Bones Found in Kent's Hole near Torquay, Devon* ("by the Rev. J. MacEnery in October, 1825"). This was printed and a plate to illustrate the fossils and some bones unearthed not far from them was engraved and published with the sketch. A copy of this is in the Torquay Museum and from it Father Kevin Clark abstracted Father MacEnery's description of his sensations as he began the work which was to occupy him for the next five years and continued to be the principal subject of interest in spite of ill health for more than a dozen years until his death. Father MacEnery said:

"They were the first fossil teeth I had ever seen, and as I laid my hand on them, relics of extinct (animal) races and witnesses of an order of things which passed away with them, I shrank back involuntarily. Though not insensible to the excitement attending new discoveries, I am not ashamed to own that in the presence of these remains I felt more of awe than joy. But whatever may have been the impressions or the speculations that naturally rushed to my mind, this is not the place to divulge them; my present business is with facts.

"I pursued my search in silence and kept my good fortune a secret, fearing that amidst the press and avidity of the party

to possess some fossil memorial of the day my discoveries would be damaged or perhaps share the fate of those abstracted (on a previous visit) from Mr. Northmore's basket."

It is not surprising to learn that these first discoveries which produced such complex but satisfying feelings were followed by his devotion of a great deal of his spare time to the work of unearthing further remains. His position as chaplain probably left him free most of the days of the week after the morning Mass, though of course chaplains often had certain duties as tutors for the children of their families and sometimes were occupied also with the care of the library of the house in which they lived. Father MacEnery was not burdened in this way. It is not surprising then to hear that once the young priest's enthusiasm was aroused his discoveries in this new field were countless. Within one year he had presented collections of his finds to museums in London and Paris as well as at Bristol and York. For some reason Father MacEnery was very much interested in the collections at York and it is in the museums there that a special memoir with regard to the specimens is to be found with comments on them by Buckland, who was at that time the recognized authority in England on fossil bones and who had done more than any other to call attention to them. There are also comments by Cuvier, the great French scientist, to whom so much is owed for his researches with regard to fossils.

Sir Arthur Keith tells briefly the story of Father MacEnery's work and how much more difficult it was than might be imagined and how much devotion was needed in order to continue with it. Father MacEnery however had become so infected with enthusiasm that nothing seemed a difficult task in the pursuit of his researches. "Such was the fascination of his new pursuit that every day of the week, save one, saw the young chaplain hurrying along the short mile which lay between Tor Abbey and Kent's Hole. He quitted the light and sunshine of the dale to breathe in candlelight the dank and musty atmosphere of the cavern, so cold and piercing that it penetrated to the bone. He had to work like a navvy to reach the thing he prized, for nature, as if jealous of her secrets, had sealed down her 'former creation' under a thick stratum of dense limestone rock or stalagmite.

"The chaplain, by deft use of pick, hammer and chisel, forced his way through this barrier into the thick stratum of red earth which lay beneath; in the stalagmite itself he found fossil teeth and bones, but it was the red earth beneath which yielded him the richest rewards. Deep in this virgin red earth, lying side by side with the bones of prediluvian animals, he found, with a shock of surprise, stone implements bearing unmistakable marks of human workmanship; this observation he confirmed again and again; the young priest had made a momentous discovery; he had proved the existence of man in antediluvian times."

The men of that generation, even those who were the most advanced in knowledge of the special subject, were not yet ready to see all the significance of Father MacEnery's work. He pointed out that various implements made by man were found with the bones of extinct animals and that this indicated that man had been in existence at the same time as these animals and therefore long before the time which had been assigned for the creation of man by Archbishop Ussher (Protestant) of Dublin, who after calculating the generations of man as recorded in the Scriptures as he thought, had announced that man was created in 4,004 B. C. of a Friday afternoon about three o'clock, I believe, in the early spring. Perhaps Archbishop Ussher was not quite so definite as that, but some such impression gained ground and a great many people were quite convinced that something about like this represented actual Scriptural teaching.

As Sir Arthur Keith says, when Father MacEnery laid his fossil bones and stone implements before Dean Buckland, who was then lecturing on the subject of antediluvian remains at one of the English universities, the Dean was very much interested in the bones but was quite sure that the human implements had no special significance. When Father MacEnery gave even minute details as to the circumstances under which the specimens were found, details which would seem to indicate that animals and men must have been contemporary, the Dean shook his head and refused to allow any such notion to get to him. "If the implements were found with the bones of extinct animals," as Father MacEnery assured him, "then it was clear", he declared, "that some unlucky accident had mixed the handiwork of man with the bones of prediluvian beasts."

In spite of the discouragement that might have been expected to follow from Dean Buckland's refusal to admit his conclusion in the matter, Father MacEnery went on with his excavations undaunted by dangers and by the gradual deterioriation of health which came as the result of his exposing himself to the damp atmosphere within the dark cave and the still further risks involved according to the current notions of that time, that the emanations which exhaled from these old excavated materials were disease-bearing. There were even those who did not hesitate to say that there could not be a blessing, but on the contrary there might well be some sort of maleficent influence, on him because of his searching for the hidden things of the past which nature had so carefully covered up. In our day the men who work in the Egyptian tombs sometimes fall ill and even die and then there is newspaper discussion as to whether they are not being pursued by the spirits of those whose bones they have dared to disturb. Men do not differ much in such matters from generation to generation.

Father MacEnery did not confine his researches to Kent's Hole or Cavern, but he visited a whole series of fossil-bearing limestone caves as they are to be found in South Devon. He must have worked very hard and very constantly and he was often assisted by friends and sometimes by workmen who appreciated the privilege of sharing the young priest's labors and occasionally by well known geologists. In this way he succeeded in collecting specimens from Anstey's Cove, Chudleigh Rock, Buckfastleigh, Oreston Cave, and Berry Head. He was no mere amateur collector of curios *en masse,* for he studied his specimens very carefully and labeled them very accurately, made notes of the conditions under which they were discovered and the exact positions in which they had been lying when found, and in general laid the foundation of a series of exact details of scientific information. He was the first to discover in the British Isles the terrible sabre-toothed tiger and recognized it as the *Machairodus latidens* that had been already described over on the Continent. It is no wonder then that he has been hailed as one of the founders in England of its Pleistocene paleontology.

He was an extremely acute observer. He pointed out the difference that constantly existed between the flints found near the surface of the investigation and those which occurred deeper in. Those superficially recovered were polished as if men had devoted attention to taking the rough edges off them. Those found lower down were, as he says, "neither rubbed nor polished" but exhibit the rough serrated edge of the original fracture". He is quite willing to confess that this difference alone may not be sufficient to authorize us in assigning a higher antiquity to the rougher flints but in connexion with other evidence this is a valuable testimony as to the age. He pointed out that it was strange that flint knives had not been found with articles on the surface nor pottery found with the knives under the crust. He even suggests that metal seems to have been as yet unknown or if known not used. The men whom he was studying were in his opinion "mere savage nomads in the very infancy of a renewed race to whom life was as yet little removed from the condition of the beast they pursued".

After five years of hard labor Father MacEnery, who was a man of frail constitution to begin with (probably, a physician would say who looks back and reads the generalizations with regard to his health, a sufferer from tuberculosis), had to give up his cave labors and look seriously to the question of recuperation of strength and vigor. He took the occasion to go over to the Continent for his health and seems to have regained it to a considerable extent. While abroad he got in touch with whatever was being done along the line of paleontology in order to familiarize himself with the work of others. Over there they recognized more of the significance of his work and Cuvier's successor, Professor de Blainville, with Professor Brochant de Villiers who was teaching at the Paris School of Mines, presented his name as a prospective member of the *Société Géologique de France* and he was elected. Older professors are likely to be very conservative with regard to the acceptance of new significance for discoveries, but their successors often prove to be more open-minded.

M. de Blainville seems to have been very much taken with Father MacEnery's work and his ideas and the Frenchman in his volume on *Ostéographie* frequently cites Father Mac-

Enery's "Description of the Cavern at Kent's Hole, Devonshire", which he supposes to have been published. Unfortunately the completed work was not published in Father MacEnery's life-time, though a number of plates for it had been made partly at Father MacEnery's own expense, for he was perfectly willing to spend all that he could possibly afford in the presentation of this new scientific knowledge that he had discovered, and partly at the expense of Dean Buckland, who recognized that these discoveries were very important.

There is some question whether Father MacEnery may not have come in touch with other men who were deeply occupied with the question of the antiquity of man because of the association of certain human remains with the fossils from extinct animals that were now being discovered in many places. Father Kevin Clark in *Blackfriars* for November, 1925, suggests, for instance, that "it would be of interest to know if during his continental tour he visited Liège and became acquainted with Schmerling, who had begun similar explorations two years after the commencement of his own. Schmerling, likewise, had received very little public encouragement, although Lyell speaks of him as 'a skilful anatomist and palaeontologist'. He had discovered in limestone caves in the neighborhood of Liège not only flint implements in association with the fossils of extinct animals, but also fossil human remains which were apparently of the same epoch. Lyell examined this collection in 1833 and, unbiased critic that he was, considered the evidence unconvincing for the alleged antiquity of man. Two years later Buckland visited Liège and saw the fossils, but came away incredulous. We who are wise after the event and wonder at the shortsightedness of the experts must, however, bear in mind Lyell's own words of apology in 1863, for his failure to see, years before, the truth of Schmerling's proofs, 'A discovery which seems to contradict the general tenor of previous investigations is naturally received with much hesitation'".

Besides the dangers to his health to which Father MacEnery subjected himself and as the result of which his life was probably shortened and his capacity for work very much limited, there were other serious risks involved in his exploration of the caverns. It is easy to understand that in the darkness of

these narrow passages insufficiently illuminated by the torches that they carried, there might be yawning chasms or even deep wells into which they might be plunged or into which they might slip. Besides, in their passage through the cavern it was perfectly possible for them to disturb large pieces of rock which, once started, would be very dangerous because of their movements. Finally, there was the question of the collection here and there in certain portions of the cavern of carbon dioxide, because of lack of ventilation, which might prove very seriously endangering to the life of those who ventured into the more distant parts of the cavern.

Father MacEnery has described one of the incidents, almost a fatal accident, to which he was subjected in his cavern explorations. Once having crawled down a sewer-like tunnel beneath a stalagmite, he was overcome and only by almost a miracle was he rescued. He says, "I had only gone about a hundred paces when, owing, it is to be feared, to foul air, my light was extinguished and I was deprived of my senses. My friends supposed me lost and despaired of drawing me out. I was, however, extricated by my faithful fellow labourer, Walsh, to whom I am indebted for my life. (I was drawn out in a state of insensibility, and it was not till after some hours of exposure to the air that I recovered.) I suffered for some weeks from the consequence of this imprudence and it was some time before I was able to revisit the cave."

One is prone to wonder how in the state of scientific, that is chemical knowledge at that time, he ever ventured to go into the cavern again. Very little was known of the chemistry of gases at the end of the first quarter of the nineteenth century and the dread of them was all the greater for that reason. Was it Tacitus who said *omne ignotum pro magnifico,* which may be rendered into English I suppose, "whatever is unknown is liable to be exaggerated"? That was particularly true with regard to the dangers of gases in mines and caves. Father MacEnery's undaunted spirit in the pursuit of scientific knowledge can be best appreciated from his further continuance of his cavern explorations.

Curiously enough, while Father MacEnery was digging in Kent's Cavern in Devon, across the channel, a Frenchman, Boucher de Perthes, beginning a little later, was occupied with

very similar problems. Like Father MacEnery, the Frenchman was not officially occupied with science in any way, that is he had no teaching much less university position, his interest in fossils was just a question of his being taken by the problem of the significance of certain remains of man. He had a small official position in the Excise Department of the French government to support him and as diversion and avocation used to go down and visit the gravel pits which had been opened along the sides of the valley of the lower River Somme near Abbéville, almost directly across the Channel from where Father MacEnery was doing his work in England. Certainly these gravel pits contained fossil bones and teeth of long extinct animals associated with curiously shaped stones which the excise man faithfully gathered, labeled carefully as to their origin or at least the location where they were found, and put away until he should learn more about them. The laborers in the pits are said to have regarded him with good-natured amusement. As Sir Arthur Keith says, "These stones which Boucher de Perthes prized so highly they knew to be 'thunderbolts', whereas he being of a reasoning and therefore scientific turn of mind looked upon them as implements shaped by the hand of man. Boucher de Perthes drew the inference that man must have lived in France when the gravel terraces of the Somme valley were being formed and when the climate and the animals of his native country were altogether different from what they had come to be in our time."

In 1847, after adding to his collections for twenty years and making observations of all kinds and drawing what seemed to him inevitable conclusions, Boucher de Perthes published a book giving a full account of his discoveries. It was received with incredulity by the scientific men of the time as a rule almost without exception. His work attracted no more scientific attention in France than that of Father MacEnery did in England. As Sir Arthur Keith says, "At that time France like England was convinced that man was a recent creation and treated her archeological excise man with the same skepticism and scorn as England had meted out to her Catholic priest." He adds, "Science had to labor sixty years before the discoveries of the Reverend John MacEnery and of Boucher de Perthes fell into their just perspective."

It is always a rather serious thing for a scientist to be much ahead of his time. He is sure to be neglected; so that many a man who has made a really important discovery and sometimes has actually led up to a revolutionary revelation in some department of science will not be appreciated for what he has done until long after his death. It might possibly be thought that that would be true a hundred years ago or more when men in general were less interested in science than they are at the present time but that such a neglect of genuine scientific progress and really important scientific discoveries would be quite out of the question in the more modern time approaching our own, and especially toward the end of the nineteenth century when science came to occupy such a prominent place in the world.

This is only a little flattering unction laid to our souls and a nice bit of smug self-appreciation, but as a matter of fact we are no better than preceding generations whenever it comes to the acceptance of something really new in science. Abbot Mendel and his work illustrated that very strikingly. He made some 10,000 observations on pea plants in his little monastery garden (about the size of a couple of small city lots) and deduced a series of laws of heredity that revolutionized all our knowledge of the subject. He wrote his observations down, deduced his laws, published his papers in the *Transactions of the Brünn Society of Naturalists* and saw that copies of these were sent to all the great universities. All this was done in the late '60's of the nineteenth century. During the next twenty-five years men were interested as never before in the problems of heredity and environment, but they paid no attention to the work of the monk Mendel until almost the beginning of the twentieth century when four men in four different quarters of the world rediscovered hints of the laws that Mendel had outlined, looked up the literature and found that they had been anticipated completely in their work and that the whole subject had been made very clear by Mendel's observations. The twentieth century has devoted itself to catching up with Mendel. Hardly any copy of a biological journal has been published that has not contained his name and something about his work. Many numbers of biological journals all over the world have been given over almost entirely to Mendel.

Slight modifications of current theories in science or a series of observations that seem to bolster up favorite hypotheses give men scientific reputations in their own time and such men are looked upon as the leaders of science in their own day. True revolutionary discoveries that teach new ideas are often neglected, usually scoffed at a little bit and not infrequently looked upon as being rather ridiculously absurd in their claims for recognition. This was what happened to both Father MacEnery and Boucher de Perthes.

There is often the feeling that when some really very important advance in science like this is neglected or scoffed at it is because of the influence of the Church or some other direct factor in the intellectual life of the time, but men are by nature conservative. They refuse to accept new things. Twenty years ago I pointed out in my volume on *The Popes and Science* that this has always been the way with men and not a little of what was said to have been Church influence in opposition to science is not due to theology nor to religion but to the natural conservatism of men.

Professor David Starr Jordan in reviewing briefly the history of *The Struggle for Realities* in one of the essays in his *Foot-notes to Evolution* (N. Y., Appleton, 1902), has summed up the genuine significance of this supposed opposition of science and theology in some striking paragraphs. To my mind, he places the whole subject on its proper foundation, and properly disposes of the supposed conflict between religion or theology and science. He says: "But as I have said before, the real essence of conservatism lies not in theology. The whole conflict is a struggle in the mind of man. It exists in human psychology before it is wrought out in human history. It is the struggle of realities against tradition and suggestion. The progress of civilization would still have been just such a struggle had religion or theology or churches or worship never existed. But such a conception is impossible, because the need for all these is part of the actual development of man.

"Intolerance and prejudice is, moreover, not confined to religious organizations. The same spirit that burned Michael Servetus and Giordano Bruno for the heresies of science, led the atheist 'liberal' mob of Paris to send to the scaffold the great chemist Lavoisier, with the sneer that 'the republic has

no need of savants'. The same spirit that leads the orthodox Gladstone to reject natural selection because it 'relieves God of the labor of creation,' causes the heterodox Haeckel to condemn Weismann's theories of heredity, not because they are at variance with facts, but because such questions are settled once for all by the great philosophic dictum (his own) 'of monism'".

Luckily not all of Father MacEnery's work was lost. Sir Joseph Prestwich, distinguished geologist and paleontologist, gathered together Father MacEnery's scientific remains unfortunately somewhat destroyed by time and published them. He wrote a memoir on the subject giving the brave young priest due credit for all his work. Father Kevin Clark in the last of his three articles in *Blackfriars* (December, 1925) has summed that up. "Prestwich in his memoir, besides confessing the stimulating impulse of the Brixham cave explorations, loyally devoted a portion of his paper to a synopsis of the discoveries and excellent work carried out by MacEnery, thirty years before, 'whose untimely death deprived science of the results of his valuable researches'. In proof of this encomium Vivian had published an abridged edition of MacEnery's *Cavern Researches,* with seventeen of the original plates, one of which figured flint implements of a type similar to those found at Abbéville. More was done, ten years later, when Pengelly brought out a complete edition of the whole manuscript, containing the early and later drafts of the proposed work, together with all the various rewritten portions. For this useful volume of two hundred and eighty pages, whereby all the different fascicules can be collated, Pengelly deserves the gratitude of every student."

Father Clark does not hesitate to say that very probably, even if MacEnery's work had been published in its entirety, it would not have received the recognition that it deserved. It is a pity, none the less, that it was not published. He said, "One cannot but regret that MacEnery was unable, for want of support, to publish his monograph on Kent's Cavern. Although there exist so many pages of his lost manuscript, yet these are but the withered leaves of a once fruitful work. In them are disclosed many acute and careful observations on fossil mammalia, flint implements and cave exploration. Be-

sides the loss of the useful assistance of his wealth of knowledge to the scientific world of his day, much also has been lost to us that might otherwise have been more fully recorded by the exigencies of seeing his manuscript through the press. Nevertheless, recalling the scepticism with which Schmerling's valuable quartos were received, it is doubtful, even if Kent's Cavern had been completely described in print, that Brixham cave and the Somme valley would have been less celebrated."

Father MacEnery, like Father Mendel, the Augustinian, did his work so well that whether the men of his time recognized its value or not it was sure to find its proper place and true valuation in the history of science. Now after a century Father MacEnery is coming into his merited mead of appreciation for good work well done.

For those who may still be surprised that the names of priests should occur so commonly and so prominently among scientists, it may be well to recall some of the facts in this matter that have come out during the development of the history of science. For instance in Poggendorf's *Biographical Dictionary of the Exact Sciences,* which is accepted as authoritative, there are in the first two volumes the names of nearly 10,000 contributors to science from the beginning of human history until 1863. This list embraces some twenty-five centuries. No inconsiderable proportion of these, as I have said in the introduction to the second volume of *Catholic Churchmen in Science,* lived before Christianity. In spite of this a little more than ten per cent of all the names in this work are those of Catholic clergymen, that is to say nearly 1000 Catholic clergymen before 1863 had done work that gives them an enduring name in the history of science.

As a rule contributors to science who were distinguished enough to secure a place in this work belonged to professions which either required them or tempted them to occupy themselves with scientific subjects, and it might naturally be supposed that from among these had come all but a quite negligible proportion of the distinguished scientific investigators and discoverers. In spite of the presumed improbability of any considerable number of those outside scientific circles securing a place in the litany of scientists, more than one in ten of all the men distinguished for original investiga-

tion in science is a Catholic clergyman. This can only mean that a very large number of the churchmen of all periods occupied themselves with things scientific in the leisure afforded them by their clerical vocation and that nearly 1000 of them reached noteworthy distinction in their avocation. This number is magnificently significant of the attitude of the Church toward science. It is perfectly clear that there can have been no policy of opposition to science or scientific research and investigation under these circumstances. Some incidents of opposition to scientific development are inevitable in the history of the Church and science, because men are prone to be conservative, as I have said, and refuse to accept new ideas and find all sorts of excuses, some of them religious, for not accepting them. Manifestly however the policy of the Church was very favorable toward science, since so many of the ecclesiastics took up science as a favorite avocation and devoted themselves to it so faithfully that they accomplished results which have left their names forever famous in the history of science.

JAMES J. WALSH

New York City.

THE AMERICAN CATHOLIC PHILOSOPHICAL ASSOCIATION.

THE American Catholic Philosophical Association was founded 5 January, 1926, by a group of professors of philosophy, representing the leading Catholic colleges and seminaries of the United States, at a meeting held at the Catholic University of America. It had been felt for a long time, and the feeling was quite widespread, that one of the most important interests of the Church, her philosophy, should receive more attention than had been given it in our institutions of learning, and that a concerted effort was needed to bring before the learned public, especially outside the Church, the results of Catholic scholarship in this field.

Philosophical work of a most important kind had been done in the United States by Catholic scholars, but it was sporadic, unorganized, and not directed toward the attainment of well-defined objectives. Students leaving our colleges had few means of keeping in touch with the advances which are con-

stantly being made in philosophical thinking. Those who had developed a special interest in the problems of philosophy during school days had no place to look for guidance and assistance in their further studies. Again, the complaint was general and well-founded that contemporary thinkers, especially in our own country, neglected to acquaint themselves with the position of Scholasticism on important questions, and in some cases were bitterly antagonistic to it, this being due, as it was believed, to the fact that they were almost totally ignorant of what our real teachings are. How to interest college students and seminarians in philosophy, how to maintain and develop this interest after they had left school, how to bring to the attention of the learned world the contributions of Scholasticism in the field of philosophy? These questions were asked on every side and answered according to the lights and zeal of those who propounded them.

The American Catholic Philosophical Association is the organized answer to the hopes of those who are committed to the philosophy of St. Thomas. Our first objective is to bind together Scholastics into a firm, compact whole, and from this association one with another to obtain light and guidance in the problems which we are called upon to face as teachers of philosophy. As Dr. Pace, the President of the Association, said in his inaugural address: "However sound our doctrines *in se,* their exposition and defence call for *thinkers,* that is, for men who are trained to philosophize. Consequently, while the main purpose of our Association is to enlarge and deepen our knowledge of philosophy, we shall not do well to exclude the discussion of method—I mean the method of teaching and the method of studying philosophy. As in all education, content, if wisely selected, helps to develop the power of thought, yet gets its full value through method, so and for still greater reason, the teaching of philosophy should not only impart knowledge but also give a training which will enable the student to work out problems for himself and make the study of philosophy a source of enjoyment rather than a necessary evil."

The second purpose of the American Catholic Philosophical Association is to bring to the attention of thinkers the truths which underlie our philosophical position. There is beginning

to be exhibited on all sides a new and lively interest in things medieval. The foundation of the Medieval Academy of America recently is a most significant indication of the direction toward which men's minds are now turning. The interest in medieval philosophy is one, if not the most important, expression of this new orientation of thought. How are we going to supply thinkers who earnestly desire to know our philosophy with the data from which they can appraise and judge the strength of our position? Seldom will they read works written in Latin; neither will they take the time to go through huge tomes devoid of those graces of style which even philosophers demand to-day as a *sine qua non* before delving into a work. Books are needed which will express in clear, terse, and sprightly English the doctrines of Scholastic thought.

A review which will make known the results of our thinking is no less necessary. The American Catholic Philosophical Association will publish a Quarterly Review of Philosophy, the first number of which should appear toward the end of 1926. The Association will also encourage the publication of monographs and brochures dealing with the technical problems of philosophy.

At this writing over 250 members have joined the Association. They are representative of the best thought of the Church in the United States. Thirty members of the Hierarchy have become Patrons of the Association, and practically every large college and seminary is represented amongst its membership. This number may appear small to some, but it is the germ from which we confidently hope to see developed a great work to the lasting interests of Holy Church and of our Country.

The American Catholic Philosophical Association begins its first year most auspiciously under the presidency of the Right Reverend Edward A. Pace, Vice-Rector of the Catholic University of America, whose work for philosophy and whose interest in Catholic thought are too well-known to need comment. It starts, too, with the most significant approval and blessing on the part of His Eminence, Cardinal Bisleti, the Prefect of the Sacred Congregation of Seminaries and Universities, a translation of whose letter is here appended. It

shall be our task, as His Eminence points out, to make of this new Association of Philosophers "the leaven . . . by which all minds shall be permeated with the truth, and from which both civil and domestic society shall receive new vigor and the Church of Christ ever increasing glory". May we prove equal and true to the generous expectations which on all sides are expressed of the future of the American Catholic Philosophical Association!

JAMES H. RYAN
The Catholic University, Washington, D. C.

LETTER FROM THE SACRED CONGREGATION OF SEMINARIES AND UNIVERSITIES ON THE AMERICAN CATHOLIC PHILOSOPHICAL ASSOCIATION.

ROME, 4 MAY, 1926.

RIGHT REVEREND EDWARD A. PACE,
VICE-RECTOR OF THE CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY,
WASHINGTON.

Right Reverend Sir:

We have received with pleasure the news of the organization of the American Catholic Philosophical Association and we sincerely congratulate you, with whose loyalty to the Roman Church and ever watchful care of sound doctrine we are fully acquainted, on the fact that you were elected unanimously to the presidency of the Association.

We have the highest hopes that under your direction the study of Christian philosophy will be increasingly developed with most beneficial results not only to ecclesiastical but to civil and domestic society as well.

As every one knows, false philosophy is the root and support of a great many errors which, spreading far and wide, hinder men from accepting divine revelation and strike at even those rational truths which are the foundation of the whole moral and social order. Once these are shaken, the structure of life, individual, domestic and social, is bound to fall. As a remedy for such evils nothing is more timely or efficacious than to bring back the minds of men to the well-established principles of Christian philosophy. This is your task; to this work you should apply all the resources at your command.

You well understand that we, in conformity with innumerable pronouncements of the Holy See, mean by Christian philosophy that philosophy which Aquinas taught, he who was raised up by a special grace of God, "that the Church might have a teacher of philosophy whom she could follow at all times" (Benedict XV, *Praeclara,* 5 February, 1919). Whatever elements of truth were to be found in the ancient philosophers, especially in Plato and Aristotle, whatever acceptable doctrines had been brought out and taught by the Fathers of the Church, and particularly by St. Augustine, all these the Angelic Aquinas built into a compact organic whole, enhancing them in clearness and depth, completing them with the penetration of his genius, and thus elaborating a system "which the Church has made her own". (Pius XI, *Studiorum Ducem,* 29 June, 1923). These teachings, which are built upon and sustained by principles of highest evidence, correspond perfectly at the same time both with the deliverances of common sense and with the surely established conclusions of natural science, and are therefore readily adaptable to the intellectual needs of every age and most useful for the refutation of errors which are constantly reappearing.

The Angelic Doctor "made a necessary distinction, and rightly so, between reason and faith, yet, finding them in harmony, he kept intact the rights and upheld the dignity of each" (Leo XIII, *Aeterni Patris,* 4 August, 1879). So well did he do this that "nowhere is the perfect accord of faith and reason more evident than in the books written by that prince of philosophers, Thomas Aquinas" (Leo XIII, *Pergratus,* 7 March, 1880). In his writings, too, the student of the Sacred Sciences "will find the means of demonstrating the basic truths upon which the Christian faith is erected, as well as arguments in behalf of supernatural truths, and weapons to repel the attacks of the enemies of our holy religion" (Leo XIII, *Cum hoc sit,* 4 August, 1880).

"Who has explained better the nature and method of philosophy, who has more accurately distinguished its different parts and pointed out the importance of each?" (Pius XI, *Studiorum Ducem,* 29 June, 1923.) "His metaphysical teachings, although they have been and are frequently, even at the present time, the subject of unjust attack, nevertheless still

retain in entirety both their value and luster, like gold which no acid can dissolve: and therefore," as Pius X has rightly stated, "we cannot abandon Aquinas, particularly in metaphysics, without suffering serious loss" (Encyclical *Pascendi,* 8 September, 1907: Pius XI, *Studiorum Ducem*).

Equally removed from Sensism and Idealism, the teachings of Aquinas concerning the human composite, that is to say, of the intellectual soul as the substantial form of the human body, opened a royal way to a satisfactory explanation of the mutual relations which exist between matter and mind, between sensation and intellection, between the lower and the higher appetites, avoiding thus the errors both of those who reduce knowledge to mere sensation and of those who deny all value to sense experience and accordingly take refuge in Idealism. "Concerning the value of human knowledge what is taught by Our Philosopher is really an unassailable doctrine. . . . The human intellect naturally knows Being and those things which are the properties of Being considered as Being, and in this knowledge is founded our perception of first principles" (*Contra Gentiles,* II, c. 83). "By this doctrine the errors and views of recent writers, who deny that Being can be perceived by the human mind and assert that only our subjective experiences can be known, are destroyed at their very roots: the agnosticism which flows from such errors has already been condemned vigorously in the Encyclical *Pascendi*" (Pius XI, *Studiorum Ducem*). Likewise, the teaching of Aquinas concerning the subordination of will to intellect and the mutual relations of these faculties in the act of free will are such that they completely overthrow the errors both of those determinists who deny human freedom and of those who affirm that freedom is not circumscribed by any limitations whatsoever. But Aquinas did not explore merely truths of the speculative order: he developed an ethics whose solidity and conformity with the tenets of divine revelation are beyond all compare. "Thus in the *Pars Secunda* of the *Summa Theologica* excellent, in truth, are the doctrines which he teaches on such subjects as the government of the family and the home, on the legal rights of the state and the nation, on natural rights and the rights of nations, on peace and war, on justice and sovereignty, on laws and their observance, on the duty of providing both for individual

needs and the public welfare; and all of this both in the natural and supernatural order. If these teachings were followed exactly and without exception both in public and in private as well as in the relations of nations toward one another, nothing further would be required in order to establish amongst men that *Peace of Christ in the Kingdom of Christ* for which the peoples of the world so ardently long.

"For the attainment of these purposes it is greatly to be desired that the teachings of Aquinas should be better known, especially those points concerning the rights of nations and the laws which should regulate the relations of nations toward one another, since in these principles are contained the true foundations for what has been called a League of Nations" (Pius XI, *Studiorum Ducem*).

What more is there to be said? The Angelic Doctor, as you well know, laid down the most solid ethical and social principles by which it is possible to solve questions of present-day moment, such as those affecting the rights and duties of civil authority and the limits within which these same rights and duties must be exercised. These principles assist us also in dealing with controverted points concerning such things as the right of private ownership of property, public education, the rights of parents, the nature of contracts, and the maintenance of a just price; they also throw light on the relations between capital and labor, master and servants, the right of association, and other questions in which justice and equity are involved.

Do then your utmost that the study of Christian or Thomistic philosophy be developed, and may the new Association of Philosophers, over which you preside, become the leaven as it were, by which all minds shall be permeated with the truth, and from which both civil and domestic society shall receive new vigor and the Church of Christ ever increasing glory.

We beg for you every blessing from God.

Devotedly,

CAJETAN CARD. BISLETI
Prefect.

THE ARCHBISHOP'S POCKET-BOOK.

IX. Clerical Training.

"THE Seminary is cracked, Your Grace," ejaculated Tom Burns, as he opened the door of the dining-room for the Archbishop, after Mass.

"Cracked? What do you mean?"

"Why, there is a big crack all the way down the first story of the old building. I saw it this morning when the milkman who brought the cream showed it to me. It must be them sewer-people, Your Grace."

The Archbishop went in to breakfast, without asking details. He knew that Burns had made what he thought an important discovery. Comment might increase his valet's opinion that, since he had found the diocesan establishment tottering, it would also require his Celtic shoulder-blade to uphold it.

The fact was this. The city authorities had been widening the street opposite the archiepiscopal residence, which adjoined the larger building used as a dwelling for the alumni of the theological seminary. Here the students in sacred orders were housed during their final course. This method of segregation afforded them facilities for better instruction and practice, especially in the ceremonies on the solemn feasts at the cathedral. It also permitted the Archbishop a more immediate supervision of the candidates called for ordination. He wanted to know them personally, before imposing hands on them. Morever, he thus kept in close touch with the professors engaged in teaching pastoral theology. There were two or three laymen who supplemented the instruction in pastoral medicine and law. For a part of the year an expert in bookkeeping was called in. These adjunct professors were well known to the Archbishop, who sometimes was present at their lectures and made it understood that he meant to be responsible for what they taught. Occasionally he examined the theological students in these branches.

The total effect of this system was that he kept track of the teaching, and came to know the minds and special talents of the young men. On the other hand they got to know their Archbishop. His presence among them produced a gradual sense of trust and unanimity, making plain to them how they

were to act in the pastoral care of souls. The students thus became familiar with certain methods of administration before they received faculties for the exercise of their ministry.

While this mode of conducting the higher theological seminary took much of the Archbishop's time, the result proved exceedingly valuable in the actual management of diocesan affairs; for it established a mutual confidence and intimate knowledge of the most approved ways and means, such as no other method which he might have devised could secure.

The opening of the Alumnate, near the cathedral residence, had been the outcome of a somewhat sad experience under his own eyes—of failures and neglects in seminary training which appeared to have arisen from lack of personal supervision and direct interest in the conduct of the institution on which, above all others, depended the future weal of the Church under his care. The Ordinary had, of course, received the reports from the superiors of both the higher and the preparatory departments of the seminary. And he had also paid them occasional visits, especially on patronal feasts and on the customary examination days, besides keeping control of the financial management through the diocesan official.

Everything regarding the seminary seemed to run smoothly and to the satisfaction of those concerned in its direction. But there had occurred an incident which for a time shook the Archbishop's confidence. A scandal causing him to blush before the father of one of the junior students, who deemed it his duty to report what he and his wife had heard from their son, showed that a spirit of laxity in the seminary existed which had not been suspected. The matter was investigated. Disorders in discipline were traced to various causes. They seemed to be due chiefly to the frequent absence of one or another of the superiors. The rector left the charge of the internal regime, in the main, to the vice-rector, who also acted as econome of the house. In their absence the authority had fallen to one of the younger subordinates, but the latter, not caring to make himself odious, preserved a temporary popularity with everybody by not insisting upon too strict an observance of the rules. Clerical and social conventionalities demanded the attendance of the older members, including the rector, at public functions and celebrations. It was to be

expected that the latter, who had prospects of being advanced to more useful and important positions, should be in evidence on festive occasions—and these were many.

The Ordinary had been aware of all this. He held the rector in high esteem. Not only was the priestly conduct of the latter beyond criticism but he was also a cultured gentleman who did honor to the diocese. Being an excellent preacher and after-dinner speaker, he was liked by the clergy; and laymen found him invariably genial and urbane. But he lacked the sense of responsibility and the latent will-power which makes for the character essential in a superior. Expediency, rather than spiritual motives, guided him in matters which concerned the conduct of ecclesiastical affairs, while a certain foresight with which he followed out plans of general improvement gave his administration the appearance of success. In reality it proceeded from the wish to stand well with the public, if not from fear of criticism or human respect.

The men selected to teach in the seminary were, all of them, priests of superior gifts, and they formed a congenial part of the diocesan clergy. They were for some reason or other not expected to take part in the discipline of the house, so as to make them responsible for the conduct of the seminarians outside class. This left the management and control of the moral training in the hands of a prefect, who, although he was a priest, did not have the experience and gravity of one to whom the students might naturally look for guidance. The division prefects in sacred orders followed the lead and policy of their immediate heads. A religious from one of the city churches acted as confessor, and other priests were called in from time to time, as the canons ordain, to give spiritual conferences and retreats to the seminarians.

What had shocked the Archbishop and disturbed the order of things for the moment had originated with one of the seminary servants. National or family relations had involved one or two of the sacred orders men. The prefect, through false pity, had shielded them and thus increased the evil. It became evident that there was a decided lack of control in the seminary. Personal investigation had led the Archbishop to the conclusion that the institution required more of his individual and sustained attention. It was then that he planned

a reorganization of the house, and to bring this about he found an expedient in the foundation of the Alumnate, mentioned at the beginning of this chapter. The old building used for this purpose had given concern to Tom Burns. As chief cathedral sexton, he considered himself godfather of the diocesan system, and he was fortunate to have found the crack in the seminary wall.

His Grace, before beginning Little Hours, as was his habit in the morning, had gone out to inspect the fissure in the old house. Afterward he spoke to Father Martin about consulting a competent architect on the nature of the break, and the possible necessity of removing the students from the place. Later in the day, when the vicar had seen the city authorities, and was assured by them that there was no immediate danger to the building, the diocesan consultors were called together to discuss the damage done to the property, as it might turn out to be serious.

Among the notes jotted down and placed in the Archbishop's pocket-book next day, was one which read: "Devise plans for reconstruction of seminary building. Consult Mr. N. (the banker) about available financial resources for the purpose." Tom, who deemed it his duty conscientiously to glance at the jottings in the Archbishop's pocket-book—unless they were enclosed in an envelope, or folded up—was satisfied. He had given warning, and the diocesan authorities were ready to respond. The Archbishop would drive to the bank before dinner and . . .

Now, by the side of the wallet, which it was Burns's business to see placed in the pocket of the Archbishop's greatcoat before his going out, there lay this morning a small notebook in paper covers, somewhat crumpled as though it had been handled a great deal. Tom had never seen it before, although he was familiar with every corner, drawer and closet in his reverend master's room. Somehow this little stranger piqued his curiosity and made him turn over the cover. At the top of the first page he read: *Car.—Hum.—Pat.*—What followed looked like a poem. It was in neither Irish nor English; of that he felt sure. So it must be Latin. Of the three words, he knew *Car* and *Pat* to be names; whether they meant that there was

anything wrong with the carriage, or with Patrick the driver, or with both, was a mystery. As for the Latin verses, his native contempt for poetry made him shudder at the idea of His Grace wasting precious time writing poems, even if they were in Latin. Father Martin, to whom the cover of the little notebook was not entirely unknown, might have told him that *Car.* stood for *Caritas, Hum.* for *Humilitas,* and that *Pat.* meant, when written in full, *Patientia;* furthermore, that the numbered lines which followed in the prelate's handwriting:

1. Nescit regere qui nescit diligere
2. Nescit gubernare qui nescit juvare
3. Nescit dirigere qui nescit silere
4. Nescit regere qui nescit obedire
5. Nescit dirigere qui nescit praevidere
6. Nescit gubernare qui nescit seipsum mortificare
7. Nescit regnare qui nescit corrigere
8. Nescit regere qui nescit laudare
9. Nescit dirigere qui nescit onera portare
10. Nescit subditos gubernare qui nescit soli Deo laborare—

simply meant that a pastor cannot rightly direct the subjects of his flock unless he possesses the art of loving and helping them; that unless he has the power of holding his tongue, and knows how to observe God's law, he is sure to be a failure as a superior. If he cannot foresee the consequences of his actions he lacks the essential element of a director. Nor can he govern others, unless he govern himself by checking his appetites and sensuous inclinations. One in authority who has not the courage to correct what he sees amiss in his subjects, or who cannot appreciate merit in others, fails in his office. To be a leader of men one must be capable of overcoming difficulties by forbearance. A ruler has to be constantly mindful that to labor for God confers a title which honors him more than purple or mitre.

Evidently the Archbishop had not intended to leave his personal diary open to the inspection of others; but, being in Latin, the contents of the little journal were safe enough with the sexton.

To a capable reader the diary would have revealed that in his notes the Archbishop was making frequent reference to the

contents of two large tomes on his desk, bound in pigskin and bearing the title-legend: *Opera S. Caroli Borromaei—Acta Ecclesiae Mediolanensis.*

After the sermon on Sunday, a prominent lawyer stopped at the cathedral residence to confer with the Archbishop on the question of the proposed new seminary, the building of which had been urged by the preacher. As legal adviser he was frequently consulted by people in the parish regarding bequests. Recently he had formulated a will for one of his clients in which the Ordinary of the diocese was made chief executor and trustee, a fact which was known to the beneficiaries. Now he came to ask whether, in view of what had been said in the sermon, he might use his influence to secure the client's consent to have the bequeathed property sold at once. He thought that the latter would be quite willing and it would relieve the Archbishop's anxiety regarding the question of funds. The result of the interview with the testator was that a week later His Grace returned with quite a number of documents folded in his pocket-book. These represented a considerable sum of money, as Tom Burns realized when he glanced at the inscription: "For the Seminary Fund", which he promptly placed (mentally) to his own credit.

The impetus given the project of reconstructing the diocesan seminary, through sermons and the religious press, brought success, and the Archbishop was, for the time being, completely absorbed in his plans for erecting a model building. But while the material structure appeared a necessity called for by local circumstances, he welcomed the opportunity of organizing a system by which the religious life-blood of the diocese should be renewed and nourished for generations to come. The vacation period was not far distant, and this would give him a temporary respite from the more arduous duties of his office. He resolved to devote that time wholly to the study of ecclesiastical reorganization.

As was understood by all, the opening of the Alumnate had made something of a change in the matter of preparing men in minor and sacred orders for the priesthood. The rules for the students of the preparatory seminary were now enforced with more than former vigilance. Still, matters were only in

a process of partial reconstruction, due to the limitations of locality and personnel. It was an advantage to have the senior students in theology near the cathedral for the services, and under the Ordinary's immediate eye; but it was questionable whether, in the event of rebuilding, this system could be maintained. A new edifice was deemed necessary, to provide accommodations for the student body and for a corps of professors whose efficiency depended largely on their being united and under common direction.

"It is not a question of putting up a grand building, with complete appointments and the most up-to-date equipment," His Grace had said to one of the pastors who, having raised a large sum in his parish, had brought it to the cathedral with the proud suggestion, "Let us have the finest seminary in the country!"

"We must first completely organize the *interior* structure, by providing a definite method of spiritual training, a uniform and continuous system of studies, and a discipline that will develop the moral and intellectual faculties. Then we may proceed, under proper conditions, to the question of housing and caring for the body."

"But won't a perfect building facilitate such conditions?"

"Undoubtedly; but it won't make them. Bad discipline going into a fine house won't do. We have to make sure that the works of a watch are in good condition before putting them into a valuable case. For that reason we shall go slowly with the building, and do our best meanwhile to have a well-organized discipline and rule."

To his vicar general the Archbishop spoke more plainly. "I am not at all satisfied that the seminary, apart from the Alumnate, is conducted in a way that lifts the young student above the materialistic spirit of our age. I glean much to make me doubt it, from occasional talks with the older members of the theological class, and especially from Mr. Maturin, who has had some experience in the world and is earnest in his following what he believes a miraculous vocation."

"But things have improved greatly since the change made two years ago when Your Grace opened the Alumnate."

"True. Nevertheless I notice a strong tinge of worldly policy in our present rector. It is constitutional, no doubt,

and he is not particularly to blame. He goes with the spirit of the times, and means well enough. But we shall have to make a change. He himself and others tell me that the actual rule of the seminary is antiquated; that it is an adoption from a French seminary, which should be changed in details of application. This opens the way to practices which depend on the personal humor of superiors and becomes a source of irregularities for which, unfortunately, no one can be readily made responsible."

"Yes, that was the difficulty in my own day. We had a system of reporting, by prefects, which made the whole discipline more like a routine of espionage and police control. To be *caught* violating a rule was to be guilty; while those who were shrewd enough to conceal their irregularities passed for satisfactory models. The same spirit was fostered in the examinations. It was invariably a question of successful hiding, or failure through discovery."

"That is an evil," said His Grace, "which can be uprooted only by spiritual training. Prefects are not intended to train; they are expected merely to report. The defect lies not with them. It comes through want of direction—spiritual direction. The young men need continual guidance, calculated to produce in them supernatural motives of action. It requires that they have a priest of mature mind as their director. A young superior—unless he is of exceptional strength of character—is naturally influenced by his surroundings, by the desire for popularity, the hope of advancement and the fear of criticism. Then there is also the tendency of wishing to make life comfortable, of avoiding hardship and seeking relief in certain popular amusements from the monotony of duty. The Celtic temperament especially retains a great deal of the boy after it realizes the sense of responsibility. Of course there is an advantage in this since it engenders enthusiasm; but in a superior it often turns out to be a hindrance to the seriousness and strength of character required in a wise governor."

Reflections like the above led the Archbishop to invite experienced priests—some of them old friends in other dioceses, who held responsible positions—to spend their vacation with him at an old villa in the suburb, which had served him for occasional retirement, and was kept by an Irish couple who

were glad to serve their archbishop. He meant to proceed slowly in the proposed work of seminary reconstruction, and he had the talent to do so in a thoroughly practical fashion. His idea was to get a full grasp of details. To this end he would himself write out a rule for the conduct of the seminary. This meant not only a complete set of regulations for the students; but another for the officials of the seminary; and a third for the servant body, which latter implied certain provisions for the conduct of the Religious to whom the domestic service of the house was entrusted.

While all this should have to be done, he meant to familiarize himself also with the material conditions under which the seminary would have to be conducted. He did not mean to adopt without good reason old and stereotyped observances and traditions, no matter how well they might be supposed to work in European seminaries. America was a new country, with elements in process of growth. Moreover, there were the different nationalities to be blended. This should have to be done in such a way as to utilize rather than eliminate the varied racial and inherited traits of disposition and character. Nor would he, while refusing to accept the imposition of traditions belonging to other lands and times, follow the popular plan of invariably adopting novel methods hailed as "advanced", simply because they favored ease and comfort. His idea of the priestly calling was that the young men were to be apostles of Christ. This meant that they were to be *reformers,* and not *conformers* who catered to the conventional but downward tendencies of the age. The standard of priestly conduct was to be the Gospel and the life of Christ, not custom, or fashion, or convenience, or expediency of a worldly sort.

In this work he might safely count on the coöperation of his clergy. His priests knew that he was not disposed to allow their building fine churches as a proof that they were advancing religion. His constant text was: Preach the Gospel; gather the people anywhere. They will come to hear you. If first you go after them, they will come after you, lest you turn away from them. Where it can be done, build first a school. The children will make the parents build the church, and will fill it after them. If you begin by building a church in the hope of getting the people into it, you are apt to end by driving them

out when you start making them pay for it before they are well grounded in their religious convictions. People who have religion preached to them in a barn, or on the street corner, want a church, and will build it. But they must first feel the need of it, and they will feel that need not because they were baptized in the Catholic Faith but because they have learned, through the preaching of the Word of God, and the zeal of apostolic pastors, that the Holy Sacrifice and the Sacraments are blessings which they cannot afford to miss for themselves and their children.

So it was His Grace's intention to build up first of all a system of seminary training and discipline, by formulating definite rules adapted to actual conditions, and with the single aim of reproducing in the young candidates for the priesthood the spirit of the Apostles trained by Christ. That spirit had converted pagan Rome, with its mighty world-civilization and culture, not by adopting or conforming itself to her spirit, but by the preaching and practice of humility, poverty, self-denial, under the standard of the Cross. For this purpose a faultless building was not essential, though it would help, once the system of training was well understood and made practicable.

To effect what he planned, His Grace deemed it necessary above all that he should follow a course of inquiry as to what needed correction; next to determine the proper means to put the spiritual, intellectual and physical training of seminarians on a proper basis; lastly to weed out the noxious element. Accordingly he began by examining into the defects and abuses incident to the actual system of seminary training in his diocese. Abstract rules and exhortations, however eloquent, would not bring about improvement, if they were not actually carried into effect through application and training.

To meet difficulties and cure evils it would be necessary not only to know the means by which they could be corrected, or prevented, but also to have the remedies at hand and apply them. This meant above all the right kind of personnel for the spiritual training, intellectual education, disciplinary guidance, and temporal management in the seminary.

If there should be among the students any who manifestly lacked a vocation, or were wanting in that disposition which indicates a desire for holiness and zeal for the salvation of

souls, it would be well to ascertain the fact by close observation before the new seminary was opened for actual residence. The Archbishop realized that the leprosy of evil in the young is contagious, and once it has entered a place it is hard to eliminate, even when manifest. This called for a weeding-out process; especially in the preparatory school.

Such were the thoughts which occupied and absorbed for the time the Archbishop's attention. The pocket-book was forgotten. His Grace remained at his desk for hours, rarely leaving the house, so that Tom Burns became anxious, fearing that he had overdone things in calling attention to the crack in the seminary wall.

The books lying open on the table of the Archbishop's library were: Barbadicus's *De Regimine Seminarii Universo,* and the *Institutiones Ecclesiae Mediolanensis* treating *de Seminario* by St. Charles Borromeo. An old oil painting of the Saint hung right over the book-rack containing his works.

It had been the Archbishop's habit, in the earlier years of his episcopate, to make extracts from the councils, and from his reading of the Fathers. Most of the latter were taken from the *Regula Pastoralis* of St. Gregory, the *De Officiis Ministrorum* of St. Ambrose and the *De Moribus et Officio Episcoporum* by St. Bernard. But, as the occasional marginal notes showed, the young bishop's studies had really covered a wide search for information touching his sacred office. This was gleaned from such books as Gualbertus Tornacensis's *De Officio Episcopi,* and the *Stimulus Pastorum* of that holy friend of St. Charles Borromeo, Bartolomeo de Martyribus; also, Gaddi's *Imago pastoralis ad mentem D. Pauli,* and St. Bernardine's *De Rectoribus et Praelatis,* with other works of a more recent date. In his talks to young clerics the prelate often recommended, next to the reading of the Sacred Scriptures (in which he seemed to prefer Ecclesiasticus, among the Old Testament and sapiential books), St. Chrysostom's *De Sacerdotio;* St. Jerome's *Epistolae* (especially the letter *ad Nepotianum*) and St. Cyprian, whom he used to hold up as the typical gentleman among the early Christian Fathers, and a prodigious writer despite his many active duties amid persecution, during the less than ten years of his episcopate.

For the rest, the Archbishop's studies, in his hours of leisure from the duties of administration, were of a wide and varied kind. He had a very thorough knowledge of Church law, and the application of it to the missionary conditions of America. Kenrick was his chief guide in the interpretation of the canons of councils and local synods, and, in cases of doubt, or when writing his pastoral instructions, he would call to his secretary; "Da mihi magistrum", which meant, not Tertullian, but Francis Patrick Kenrick's *Theologia Moralis.*

X. Seminary Professors.

Among the older clergy of the diocese was a priest of Dutch nationality who at one time, shortly after his coming to America, had been engaged as professor in the seminary. Father Bruskens was a thorough scholar, as they are made in Belgian colleges, familiar with the classics and a sound theologian. His knowledge of English was limited, but he was anxious to learn, and as he spoke Latin fluently he did excellent service. After a little over two years he was removed. The authorities, being in need of a priest to minister to the French and German immigrants, appointed him to the mission service. This he liked very well. The old gentleman had a refreshing frankness of speech which made him both feared and liked among the clerical brethren. He was no respecter of persons in stating what he thought needed correction by his superiors. Once, when he found that there was a considerable number of Polish laborers employed in certain sections of the district who had no priest to look after them he spoke to the Ordinary in their behalf. The Bishop, not having a priest to supply the want, hesitated somewhat saying: "What can we do? We have no priests who speak their language". Our Dutch priest answered bluntly: "It is your business to find one. If you don't try, you will go to hell with the sheep which, being yours, are lost." "But," replied His Grace, "if I try and fail?" "Then," answered the priest, "I will learn their language and go to them."

It occurred to the Archbishop amidst his studies that if he wanted to get some straight statements and sound views about seminary education, or rather a frank expression of what might need improvement in the present status of the diocese,

Father Bruskens was the man to consult. He knew very well that a certain human respect, or what men of the world call prudence, on the part of inferiors keeps bishops in ignorance of things going on before their very eyes. Racial constitution has some influence in this matter. The Celt especially, though he likes to rule, does not want to be controlled. Hence it is often difficult, unless under army rules, to get from them a candid expression about discipline. Personal independence is protected by avoiding responsibility. Hence an Irishman will rarely, unless he cannot help himself, report a delinquency under his care to a higher officer. The odium traditionally attaching, among his own people, to the so-called "informer", makes him sensitive to revealing what he knows of those who might show their resentment against him later on. The Dutch, like the English, are more independent in this respect. Hence the Archbishop made up his mind to discuss the seminary with Father Bruskens at the very first opportunity.

When Father Bruskens did not come to the cathedral for some time (the Archbishop having left word that he wished to speak to him in case he should call), he was sent for by the vicar general. Some business pretext furnished occasion for detaining him for dinner. When the coffee had been served and the guest with Father Martin was enjoying a smoke, word came that the Archbishop would like to see both of them a little later. It was the custom of His Grace to take a brief siesta—forty winks, as he called it.

"Well, Father Bruskens, what have you been doing by way of preaching support of the proposed new seminary? Being an old professor I expect that you are taking a lively interest in the collection for the building which we hope to put up."

"My people are poor. They have no money to put up stone walls which will only make their future priests proud and lazy."

"Oho! Is that your attitude? But we must house them; and when we do so, it is only proper that we should select the best material available for the purpose. You remember David's injunctions to Solomon for building the tabernacle of the Lord. When the young king put up the temple at Jerusalem he also provided suitable dwellings for the levites and members of the sanctuary service. The most precious marble

and wood were employed, while the Hebrew people rejoiced in the magnificence of the buildings on Mount Sion, so that its beauty became a by-word among the gentiles. Should not we emulate the zeal of the wisest of that royal race who was to become the progenitor of the Great High Priest?"

"If Your Grace refers to Solomon, I recall that he went to the devil because of his pride in building."

"Not because of his pride in building—was it?"

"Yes, it may have begun by causing the Queen of Sheba and her likes to admire his temple and the palace for himself and the levites. But it ended by turning his zeal into building temples for pagan women and their idols, Moloch and Astaroth, the gods of the Sidonians, and to Chamos, the scandal of Moab, and to Melchom, the abomination of the children of Ammon, the shameless king."

"Well, we don't expect to do that. We shall keep away from the Queen of Sheba and her clan, or take their admiration at a distance. At any rate you would not want us to carry on the work of the seminary in the open fields or in tents, like the Salvation Army?"

"It would be a good thing if some of the Salvation Army system got into the seminary, before the fine buildings are put up."

The Archbishop smiled. He was getting his Dutchman where he wanted him.

"O well, of course, we must have good discipline. And the course of studies shall have to be revised. But we hope to enlarge the corps of professors."

"Perhaps Your Grace is thinking of bringing Father Bruskens back to teach theology," put in the vicar general.

"God forbid, Archbishop; don't do that. I like study and teaching; but I am satisfied with my present job, and don't want to change" said the priest. "You don't need more professors, even if you have twice as many students as were in the seminary in my time. What you need is to make the professors work more."

"How? You don't mean to say that our professors in the seminary are not hard workers. Why they not only assist us here at the cathedral whenever there is special need; but they are constantly helping out in the city and country parishes

throughout the diocese. All their spare time from teaching in the seminary is given to hearing confessions and preaching."

"That is just what is wrong. They mind other people's business better than their own."

"But they teach their students. From what I hear and know they are capable and efficient, which shows that they attend to their studies and classes. You don't mean to charge them with neglect. If any of the students fail, it is not the fault of their teachers. Surely it is to their credit that they help in saving souls besides attending their studies in the seminary."

"In my opinion," said Father Bruskens, "it is the business of the professors in the seminary to attend to the salvation of the souls there and not elsewhere. If Your Grace confirmed and ordained, doing things which we priests cannot do because they are reserved to the episcopal order, you would be performing the functions of the archbishop, but that would not mean that you did your duty if you did nothing else, and went off into other dioceses preaching and dining to prove that bishops are hospitable. My idea of a professor in the seminary is that of an educator. To educate the students he must help them not only to know their studies or the science of philosophy and theology, but how to become more perfect spiritually and how to save other souls."

"Well, isn't that done by the spiritual director, the confessors, and the master of discipline, who are especially charged with the spiritual supervision and training of the seminarians?"

"They can't do it properly if the professors don't help. There must be harmony of principles and of action in the same house. That is impossible if the professors are habitually attending to business outside. They are influenced by the opinions and associations of the pastors to whom they are called, instead of setting an example. They cannot correct abuses in which they are expected to take part, and they handicap the spiritual direction in the seminary."

"How now, Father, aren't you somewhat over-severe and prejudiced?"

"Not a bit. Suppose a student in the seminary whom a pastor favors for one reason or another, and whose people live in the parish, has to be disciplined or expelled. The pastor

opposes the opinion of the authorities in the seminary. He talks it over with the professors. They get their stipends and Mass intentions from him. They meet his friends in the parish and at his home. If they vote adversely, they lose his esteem. Hence their influence naturally goes in his direction. Don't talk to me about independence. I have seen enough of it in priests who are the nicest possible fellows to live with; but who for all that may lack supernatural views and backbone. If they are in the seminary let them attend to their business of saving souls there, and not run outside to have their fun. Usually they preach a poor sermon; and knowing little of the parish they are apt to muddle things in the confessional at Forty Hours' while neglecting their own business. Your Grace says they attend to it. Well, sometimes they do and sometimes they don't. That depends on circumstances. If there is a requiem or a marriage in the morning, the professor is invited. He can hardly find time to attend, for he has class. Still he could stretch a point, even if he is five minutes late coming to his students. That he should prepare for his teaching is a theory but not always a practice; and he thinks himself virtuous because he has helped a brother priest who wants to go on a fishing trip or take a long sleep. That is not what Christ taught His apostles."

"He taught them to preach to all men and to exercise charity as a fruit of the Holy Ghost, a lesson which we have had only recently in the office for Pentecost."

"What I read in my office for Pentecost was that the disciples were all with one accord in one place, where they were being instructed and where the Holy Ghost came upon them. That one place is the seminary. If they were afterward sent to preach, it was as missionaries."

"So you think the professors should not go out to help their brother priests on the mission? That seems hard."

"I don't think that. But they ought to make the seminary their home, and take an interest in everything that concerns the student body, not leaving the spiritual training entirely to the prefect of discipline whom the boys regard more in the light of a policeman than as a spiritual father. The Council of Baltimore says somewhere about the professors that, like the Superiors, *horum erit vitia si qua deprehenderint notare et corrigere.*"

"I quite understand", said His Grace, "that the professors should have a part in the moral or spiritual training as well as in the intellectual instruction, and that a teacher of necessity must love his pupils and be interested in their religious education. Also that there is danger of lowering the standard of ecclesiastical perfection by habitual contact with pastoral conditions which are not always a type of the sanctity to harmonize with the training in the seminary as demanded by the canons. Naturally a professor who finds himself obliged to do as the others do in matters of parochial practice, loses the sense of what is elevating and inspiring in his intercourse with the students. Still the men in the seminary need diversion and they must cultivate friendly relationship with the outside clergy. Moreover they are deprived of the domestic comforts which may be found in a parish house where the pastor and his assistants keep up the clerical family spirit."

"That could be cultivated in the seminary. The professors need agreeable community life surely, and they will have it if you make a home for them there where they meet and exchange views about their work for the students. That was the way we had at Ghent, and I was much disappointed when I found it was different here in America. For that reason I was glad to get out of the seminary, though I liked both the studies and the men."

With that the old priest took up his hat. As he knelt to kiss the Archbishop's hand the latter detained him for a moment saying "God bless you, Father Bruskens. I shall think over what you have told us."

Later on in speaking with the vicar general he reverted to the topic. They both agreed that there was a good deal of common sense in the old man's critical observations.

[TO BE CONTINUED]

Analecta

SACRA CONGREGAZIONE DEI SEMINARI E DELLE UNIVERSITÀ.

AMERICAN CATHOLIC PHILOSOPHICAL ASSOCIATION

Rev.me Domine.

Pergratum accepimus nuntium de fundata consociatione inter christianae Philosophiae cultores in Statibus Foederatis Americae Septentrionalis, ac tibi cuius in Romanam Ecclesiam fidele obsequium, et sanae doctrinae pervigil studium probe noscimus, vehementer gratulamur, quod eidem consociationi praeses communi suffragio fueris datus.

Te enim moderante, spes arridet fore ut christianae philosophiae cultus altius in dies accrescat, uberrimosque gignat fructus nedum ecclesiasticae sed et civili et ipsi domesticae societati perutiles.

Omnibus siquidem compertum est in falsa philosophia radicari et ab ea tutamen accipere errores quamplurimos, qui late per orbem grassantes homines arcent a divina revelatione suscipienda ac ipsas inficiunt naturales veritates, quibus totus moralis et religiosus ordo innititur, et quibus concussis, ipsa vita individualis, domestica et socialis corruat necesse est. Tot malis medendis haud opportunius aptiusve extat remedium quam animos ad christianae philosophiae inconcussa principia revocare. In hoc laborandum, in hoc totis viribus insistendum.

Hinc probe intelligitis ex innumeris S. Sedis documentis christianam philosophiam nos vocare quam tradidit Aquinas divinitus excitatus "ut haberet Ecclesia quem doctrinae magistrum maxime in omni tempore sequeretur" (Benedictus XV, *Praeclara,* 5 Febr. 1919). Quaecumque enim vera ab antiquis philosophis, praesertim a Platone et Aristotele, et quaecumque recta ab Ecclesiae Patribus, maxime vero a S. Augustino, detecta et tradita sunt, Angelicus Aquinas in unum corpus organicum mire collegit, profunditate et perspicuitate auxit, et acie sui ingenii complevit, concinnavitque doctrinam "quam Ecclesia suam fecit" (Pius XI, *Studiorum Ducem,* 29 Jun. 1923), et quae cum instructa sit atque apparata principiis latissime patentibus merito simul respondet iis omnibus quae ex sensu communi habentur, et iis quae indubitata et certa in quacumque humana scientia inveniuntur, estque aptissima ad omnium temporum necessitates, et ad pervincendos errores continuo renascentes maxime accommodata.

Angelicus "rationem, ut par est, a fide apprime distinguens, utramque tamen amice consocians, utriusque tum iura conservavit, tum dignitati consuluit" (Leo XIII, *Aeterni Patris,* 4 Aug. 1879) ita ut "perfecta fidei intelligentiaeque concordia facile nusquam melius apparet quam in libris a principe Philosophorum Thoma Aquinate exaratis" (Leo XIII, *Pergratus,* 7 Martii 1880), ex quibus sacrae disciplinae cultor "eruet unde fundamenta fidei christianae valide demonstret, veritates supernaturales persuadeat, nefarios hostium impetus a religione sanctissima propulset" (Leo XIII, *Cum hoc sit,* 4 Augusti 1880).

"Quis philosophiae naturam, rationemque, partes earumque vim melius explicavit" (Pius XI, *Studiorum Ducem,* 29 Junii 1923)? "Eiusdem de metaphisicis doctrina, quamquam frequenter adhuc iniquorum iudicum acerbitatem nacta est, tamen quasi aurum, quod nulla acidorum natura dissolvitur, vim splendoremque suum etiam nunc integrum retinet: recte igitur" aiebat Pius X: "Aquinatem deserere, praesertim in re metaphisica non sine magno dirimento esse" (Enc. *Pascendi,* 8 Sept. 1907: Pius XI, *Studiorum Ducem*).

A sensismo et ab idealismo aeque alienus, Aquinas doctrina de composito humano, de anima videlicet intellectiva forma substantiali corporis humani viam stravit regiam ad mutuas

relationes explicandas quae extant inter materiam et spiritum, cognitionem sensitivam et intellectivam, partem inferiorem appetitus et superiorem, scopulos devitans et eorum qui cognitionem nostram ad sole sensibilia coarctant, et eorum qui sensibili experientiae omnem valorem subtrahunt et ad idealismum se recipiunt "Ac de mentis humanae potestate seu valore sanctum est quod a Nostro traditur=*Naturaliter intellectus noster cognoscit ens et ea quae sunt per se entis inquantum huiusmodi,* in qua cognitione fundatur primorum principium notitia=(*Contra Gentiles,* II, c. 83). Hinc enim stirpitus extrahuntur errores opinionesque recentiorum qui volunt non ipsum ens intelligendo percipi, sed ipsius qui intelligat affectiones; quos quidem errores agnosticismus consequitur tam nervose reprobatus Encyclicis Litteris Pascendi" (Pius XI, *Studiorum Ducem*). Quae vero Angelicus tradit de subordinatione voluntatis ad intellectum et de harum potentiarum mutuis relationibus in actu libero talia sunt quae funditus avertant et errores deterministarum libertatem negantium, et errores eorum qui libertatem nullis circumscriptam limitibus in homine affirmant. Nec tantum speculativas veritates acutissime perscrutavit Aquinas, sed et doctrinam de moribus condidit, qua nulla solidior aut divinae revelationi conformior. "Hinc illa praeclara quae sunt in Summae Theologicae parte secunda de paterno regimine seu domestico et de legitimo imperio vel civitatis vel nationis, de iure naturae et de iure gentium, de pace et de bello, de iustitia et de dominio, de legibus et de obtemperatione, de officio vel privatorum necessitati vel prosperitati publicae consulendi, idque cum in naturali ordine tum in supernaturali. Quod si privatim, publice, atque in mutuis nationum inter nationes officiis haec sancte inviolateque praecepta serventur, iam nihil aliud requiratur ad eam hominibus conciliandam=pacem Christi in Regno Christi=quam orbis terrarum tantopere desiderat.

Optandum est igitur, ut quae in gentium iure praesertim explicando legibusque in quibus populorum inter ipsos rationes ordinantur, Aquinas docet, ea, cum verae Nationum Societatis —quae dicitur—fundamenta contineant, magis magisque pertractentur" (Pius XI, *Studiorum Ducem*).

Quid plura? Angelicus magister, ut probe scitis, principia ethico-socialia validissima adstruit ad enodandas quaestiones

in dies agitatas circa iura et officia auctoritatis civilis limitesque quibus huismodi iura et officia continentur, nec non ad controversias solvendas quae ius tangunt privatae proprietatis, civium educationem, parentum iura, contractuum naturam, iustum praetium servandum; vel relationes respiciunt inter operarios et operariorum conductores, dominos et servos, ius consociationis caeteraque huiusmodi ad quae iustitia et aequitas sese extendunt.

Macte igitur animo ut christianae seu thomisticae Philosophiae cultus dilatetur, sitque nova philosophorum consociatio, cui tu praees, veluti fermentum, quo omnium mentes in veritate firmentur, et civilis et domestica ipsa societas emolumentum capiat, ac Christi Ecclesiae semper in dies magis magisque exaltetur.

Fausta tibi omnia adpreco a Domino,

Addictissimus,

CAIETANUS CARD. BISLETI
Prefectus.

Romae, die iv Maii, 1926.

Rev.mo Domino
D. Eduardo A. Pace,
Vici-Rectori Cath. Universitatis,
Washington.

S. POENITENTIARIA APOSTOLICA.

DE FACULTATE ABSOLVENDI A PECCATO ABSOLUTIONIS PROPRII COMPLICIS.

DUBIUM.

I. Utrum in c. *Si unquam,* diei 15 jul. 1924, ubi conceditur facultas absolvendi confessarium reum absolutionis proprii complicis in peccato turpi *semel aut bis* tantum attentatae, intelligitur delictum bis attentatum et nondum remissum, an etiam delictum antea semel vel pluries attentatum, sed jam absolutione remissum?

II. An in omni casu poenitens interrogandus sit de hac circumstantia relapsus in peccatum hujusmodi jam antea remissum?

S. Poenitentiaria respondet:

Ad I. *Affirmative* ad primam partem, *negative* ad alteram.

Ad II. In ordine ad valorem dandae absolutionis, *negative;* in ordine ad occasionem relapsus removendam, si ex adjunctis opportunum fuerit, *affirmative.*

Dat. ex S. Poenit. die 5 martii 1925.

S. Luzio, *Regens.*

S. Fagiolo, *Secretarius.*

DIARIUM CURIAE ROMANAE.

Papal Appointments.

5 September, 1925: Monsignori Edward A. Lefebvre, Casimir Skory, Denis Edward Malone, and Charles D. White, of the Diocese of Grand Rapids, Domestic Prelates of His Holiness.

4 February, 1926: Mr. Peter Boyle, of the Diocese of Galloway, Knight of the Order of St. Gregory the Great, civil class.

10 March: The Right Rev. Richard Ryan, Bishop of Geraldton, promoted to the See of Sale (Melbourne).

10 March: The Right Rev. John Norton, Administrator of the Diocese of Bathurst, made coadjutor of the Bishop of Bathurst *cum jure futurae successionis.*

27 March: Mr. James J. Burns, of the Diocese of Trenton, Knight of the Order of St. Gregory the Great, civil class.

31 March: The Right Rev. James Roche, of the Diocese of Cloyne, made Bishop of Ross.

10 April: Monsignor Joachim Maffei, of the Diocese of Springfield (Massachusetts), Private Chamberlain, supernumerary, of His Holiness.

19 April: Mr. Harold Boulton, of the Diocese of Portsmouth, Private Chamberlain of Sword and Cape, supernumerary, of His Holiness.

20 April: Mr. James Cox Brady, of the Diocese of Trenton, Private Chamberlain of Sword and Cape, supernumerary, of His Holiness.

30 April: The Most Rev. Edward Howard, Titular Bishop of Isaura and Auxiliary of Rt. Rev. James Davis, Bishop of Davenport, promoted to the Archbishopric of Oregon City.

Studies and Conferences

Questions, the discussion of which is for the information of the general reader of the Department of Studies and Conferences, are answered in the order in which they reach us. The Editor cannot engage to reply to inquiries by private letter.

OUR ANALECTA.

The Roman documents for the month are:

SACRED CONGREGATION OF SEMINARIES AND UNIVERSITIES through its Prefect, Cardinal Bisleti, sends letter expressing great pleasure at the news of the founding of the American Catholic Philosophical Association. (See above, pp. 40-46.)

SACRED PENITENTIARY APOSTOLIC answers a doubt regarding the faculty of absolving a confessor guilty of the absolutum "proprii complicis *semel aut bis*".

ROMAN CURIA announces officially some recent pontifical honors.

CATHOLIC STATISTICS OF THE UNITED STATES BASED ON FIGURES FROM PENNSYLVANIA.

At various times attempts have been made to come to a correct estimate of the Catholic population in the United States. The present paper may not treat the matter from any new angle or disclose any facts hitherto unknown, but at least it deals with new figures. These are obtained from the *Catholic Directory* of 1926 and the State Board of Health. Pennsylvania is chosen as the basis because it is the only province in the country which furnishes complete figures to the *Directory*. The Catholic population thus estimated is almost exactly one-tenth of that of the whole country, so it seems plausible to say that, if there are 22 million Catholics in the country, there are 2,200,000 in Penna. Figures approved by the State Board of Health can be used conveniently because the six dioceses of the province of Philadelphia are coterminous with the State of Pennsylvania. Let us see therefore how many Catholics there are in the State.

The following figures are taken from the *Catholic Directory:*

Diocese	*Cath. Population*	*Baptisms*	*Marriages*	*Deaths*
Philadelphia	735,328	25,311	7,177	9,650
Harrisburg	80,540	3,130	822	1,077
Scranton	276,213	11,357	2,150	6,431
Altoona	149,568	4,923	944	1,177
Pittsburgh	518,790	28,149	5,508	8,121
Erie	120,238	5,224	1,125	1,595
Total.....	1,880,677	78,094	17,726	28,051

Now from the Bureau of Vital Statistics it is found that the deaths from all causes in the State during 1925 were 1240 per 100,000. The estimate of the Catholic population would therefore be 28,051 divided by 1240 and multiplied by 100,000, or 2,262,178. By this method an appreciable gain is noticed —almost 400,000. Three dioceses maintain approximately the same figures, one decreases, while two have a large increase. These latter are Pittsburgh with 135,000, and Scranton with 242,000. Pittsburgh's new figure of 654,113 is, I believe, more correct than the *Directory* calculation, but there is something strange in the Scranton computation of 518,580. This may be accounted for by a clerical error in the number of deaths which is indeed unusually large. In the remaining five dioceses the average rate of marriages to deaths is as 100 to 135, while in Scranton it is 100 to 300. Comparing the baptisms with deaths the five dioceses average 328 to 100; Scranton's rate is 176 to 100. Evidently the discrepancy is unusual, for the mining and industrial conditions which prevail in that part of the State obtain to about the same degree all over. It is possible that the high death rate is attributable to the number of foreign-born parents. Having been pastor of a mining community, I know from experience the ravages of death among babies due to lack of prenatal care. Deaths of this kind are not confined to any diocese or section and the problem might well be considered by Catholic charities' commissions. Perhaps resident nurses in such communities would be able to improve matters. The potential value of a Catholic child and its actual spiritual value are too great not to be brought to full fruition. This however is aside from the subject at hand. If the Catholic death-rate for the rest of the State held for Scranton, the deaths there should have been but 2,902. This would bring the population fairly near to the estimate of the *Directory*. It may be remarked about

death as the basis of computation that sometimes pastors are in a quandary as to how deaths should be reported to the chancery.

There is danger that deaths may be reported both by the pastor of the deceased and the pastor of the cemetery where the burial takes place. Again the proper pastor may not account for the death, thinking that this is done at the place of burial. In this case neither may report. These errors, however, would hardly be so great as to make a radical change in the computation.

Now taking marriages as the basis, the marriage rate over the State being about 1 to 125 persons, we find the following figures:

Philadelphia	897,125
Harrisburg	102,750
Scranton	268,750
Altoona	118,000
Pittsburgh	688,500
Erie	140,625
Total	2,215,750

These figures compare favorably with the estimate obtained above, taking the deaths as the basis; there is a difference of only 45,000. There is reason therefore to suppose that there are over 2,200,000 Catholics in Pennsylvania, and over 22 million in the country at large, instead of less than 19 million. To these figures must be added an additional half-million Catholics of the Ruthenian rite.

Another basis of computation remains, namely that of the baptisms. However since the Catholic birth rate is far and away beyond the average for the State, which is 1 birth to 40 persons, the figures on this basis are not reliable, but interesting anyway. They are:

Philadelphia	1,012,440
Harrisburg	125,200
Scranton	454,280
Altoona	196,920
Pittsburgh	1,125,960
Erie	208,960
Total	3,123,760

It is quite certain that there are not three million Catholics in the State. It proves for certain though, that there is a vast

difference between the birth rate of Catholics and all others in the State. A little figuring, abstracting the Catholic baptisms and a Catholic population of two million from the births and general population, seems to make the birth rate for non-Catholics 21 to 1,000, while the Catholic birthrate is about 38 to 1,000. The figure given for Pittsburg in the *Directory* would seem to be too low. It would make the Catholic birth rate for the diocese 54 to 1,000. My experience, in three parishes, is that it runs about 40 to 1,000. This would give a population of just over 700,000.

There is yet another method of arriving at the estimated number of Catholics in the State. The rate of Catholic baptisms to Catholic deaths is as 78,094 to 28,051. This may be reduced to another equation which will serve our purpose, namely 3417 to 1240. Now there were 1240 deaths over the State to 100,000 people, and since it is presumed that Catholics died in the same proportion as others, may it not be said that there were 3417 Catholic births to 100,000 Catholics? On this basis the Catholic population would be 2,285,338.

For a clearer survey let me put together the different totals.

Diocese	*Catholic Directory*	*Death Estimate*	*Marriage Estimate*	*Birth Estimate*
Philadelphia	735,328	778,225	897,125	1,012,440
Harrisburg	80,540	86,855	102,750	125,200
Scranton	276,213	518,635	268,750	454,280
Altoona	149,568	94,919	118,000	196,920
Pittsburgh	518,790	654,916	688,500	1,125,960
Erie	120,238	128,628	140,625	208,960

The totals of the first and fourth columns are respectively too low and too high. The second and third are, I think, more correct. The following are worthy of consideration:

Catholic Directory	1,880,677
Estimate from Deaths	2,262,178
Estimate from Marriages	2,215,750
Estimate from comparison of Catholic birth rate with Catholic mortality and general mortality over the state.....	2,285,338

The average of the last three estimates, I would think, should come very close to the correct number of Catholics in the state. This average is 2,254,422. Therefore there are twenty-two and one-half million Catholics in the United States.

M. J. McBURNEY

Natrona, Pa.

TWO CONVENIENT MARRIAGE TABLES.

The New Code, after several unsuccessful attempts had been made, finally extended to every part of the world the laws governing clandestine marriage. It also made a drastic change in marriage legislation by limiting the diriment impediment of Disparity of Worship to Catholics contracting with infidels. In the course of time all marriage cases will be decided according to the prescriptions of this masterpiece of codification; but, helpful as the Code is in clearing the matrimonial atmosphere, we still meet marriage cases that result from marriages entered into before its promulgation. In fact, pre-Code matrimonial alliances may present practical difficulties for another half-century, and priests even in that rather distant future will still have to be conversant with pre-Code marriage laws.

The writer, to facilitate his solution of cases involving Clandestinity and Disparity of Worship, prepared a chart of the 22 possible marriage combinations of pre-Code days, and the 10 marriage combinations of post-Code days, making in all 32 different combinations. The completed chart was submitted for criticism to several canonists, who in giving it their final approval suggested at the same time that it be published in the REVIEW.

The three things that we are particularly interested in in solving marriage cases are: *Validity, Sacramentality,* and *Dissolubility,* for a marriage, though valid, *may* be dissoluble *in favorem fidei,* provided it is not a *sacramental* union. In every instance where the case warrants, these three phases of marriage are dealt with in this chart. It does not pretend to untangle all the entanglements of the 32 combinations treated therein; but, once the evidence essential to a solution has been assembled, the chart solves the case, or at least proposes a course of action tending to final solution.

In so far as a person's baptism affects his or her matrimonial status, we might say in passing that it seems when present-day non-Catholic baptisms are subjected to the simple tests of validity prescribed by theologians, they seldom survive the scrutiny—especially when the intention of the minister is analyzed. Father Noldin says on the subject: "Licet baptismus ab haereticis collatus per se validus sit, attamen crescente in dies ministrorum acatholicorum incredulitate nunc temporis valde timendum est, ne ministri acatholici propter defectum

condicionis essentialis invalde baptizent." And again: "Certo non conficeret sacramentum, qui positive nollet facere, quod Christus instituit vel quod ecclesia catholica facit." See also the article in the REVIEW of February 1926 by Doctor Joseph P. Donovan, C.M., "Are Protestant Baptisms Ordinarily Valid."

For greater convenience this chart has been divided into two tables. One deals with marriages of non-Catholics *inter se*. The other deals with marriages of Catholics *inter se* or with non-Catholics. The first table contains 12 marriage combinations—6 before and 6 since the Code. The second table contains 20 marriage combinations—16 before and 4 since the Code. Sometimes to facilitate further investigation canon numbers are inserted in the tables in connexion with pre-Code marriages. At first sight some of the terms employed may seem a little odd, for instance, *certainly valid*. However, such a modifier is necessary to make the meaning clear. If only the word *valid* were used, immediately the question would arise: what is meant—*certainly* valid, *presumptively* valid, or *doubtfully* valid? A perfected arrangement of these tables would surely be of great assistance to seminarians and priests if it were embodied in the tract on Matrimony in our text books of Moral Theology, something like the authors do with the chart explaining Consanguinity.

We believe that with this short explanation the two tables speak for themselves. As hinted above and as stated plainly at the top of the tables, we are dealing only with *consummated* marriages not entered into before a proper priest and two witnesses (*Clandestinity*), and, if the case required it, no dispensation having been obtained from the impediment of Disparity of Worship. It is true there are other barriers to validity besides Clandestinity and Disparity of Worship, but, either from their very nature or because they have not been subject to the same vicissitudes of canon law, these other hindrances do not lead us into the labyrinthine legal lanes that Clandestinity and Disparity of Worship do.

Of course these tables will have to be amended here and there, if Rome clears up any of the things at present uncertain (for instance, how far-reaching is Canon 1127), or extends to Ordinaries faculties not now shared by them. If our chart had been prepared prior to 5 November, 1924, it would be somewhat different from what it is now, for on that day the

Holy Office in solving a case sent to it from Helena, Montana, answered (*negative*) the age-old, much-mooted question of the sacramental character of a marriage between a baptized and a non-baptized person. And the same response also proves conclusively that the Pope's power over consummated marriages is not limited *in favorem fidei* to the Pauline Privilege or Canon 1127. The marriage in question was one *certainly* valid according to the Code, and the baptism of the one party was also *certain*.

The numerous complications which these tables set before us emphasize the temerity of making hasty final pronouncements of either the *hopelessness* or the *hopefulness* of marriage cases. The territorial limitations of the *Tametsi* and *Benedictine Concession* not infrequently make it almost impossible to give correct snap judgment in cases involving the Tridentine Law. Before and also since the Code, so far as Clandestinity is concerned, it is sometimes difficult to determine, even after due deliberation, whether a person *according to his baptism* is to be adjudged a Catholic or a heretic. And in rendering a hasty decision the tendency we believe would be to pronounce invalid on the score of Clandestinity the marriage of a Catholic which was not entered into before the priest. Yet Canon 1098 (and the pre-Code legislation varied little) makes allowances for such cases in rural districts not visited by priests. Even in our flourishing American dioceses there are still places, and not all so isolated either, where a Catholic could be validly married otherwise than before a priest, for there are many towns which it may be conscientiously foreseen a priest will not visit for thirty days.

These few citations show that through haste one might give a decision that must be reversed by oneself or another after the identical evidence has been taken under advisement. There are people living estranged from God and His Church because of a marriage case which, despite the fact that they have been given a hasty final decision to the contrary, is soluble in favor of a new marriage. The Church surely teaches us by her own example to proceed slowly and cautiously in these matters.

In compiling this marriage chart the possibility of *encouraging* marriage cases has not deterred us in our solutions. The Church does not allow a similar possibility to hinder her from making marriage concessions—some even pertaining to the dissolution of the marriage bond, for example the Pauline

Privilege; Canon 1127; and Papal Dispensation as in the Helena Case. Needless to say, we would not wantonly add to the number of marriage cases. There are too many of them arising spontaneously. Parish priests, especially in our large centers of population, encounter them almost daily. Every parish in the big city has its quota of marriage cases. The suggestions offered in these two tables are for the purpose of solving those cases we meet with in the ordinary course of our ministry, and not for the purpose of fostering new cases by favoring marital liberty.

No, we would not designedly dim in the least degree the ideal indissolubility of the marriage bond—Catholic or non-Catholic. We, too, have the utmost respect for the ominous legend inscribed over the marriage bond in letters so large that he who runs may read: *"Noli me tangere!"* Like the Church, *ante* matrimony, we may go as far as our Catholic sense and priestly zeal will lead us to prevent these *tainted* marriages, but also like the Church, *post* matrimony, when a person has entered into one of them, we may relax our former severity, always of course unto edification and with discretion, lest we be guilty of casting pearls to swine. The rescuing of these much-married sheep is taught by the Good Shepherd who urges us to leave the ninety-nine docile sheep who are contented to remain in the monogamous pasture and go after the adventurous one who is in danger of perishing on some polygamous precipice. And when we save to the Church married Catholics, we usually save with them their children and their children's children. So solving soluble marriage tangles is one means of lessening the *leakage* in the Church to-day.

And so far as creating scandal goes, we must not be too solicitous. The Church is scrupulous unto the N'th power in this regard. She witnessed the maledictions hurled against scandal by her Divine Founder. Yet, when souls are to be saved, since she does not allow possible scandal to deter her in the solution of marriage cases, should we? Let it not be said of us that any souls were passed up or turned down just because they were involved in marriage cases. Christ died for these souls, so they should be worth our zealous interest.

Finally it is also well for us to remember in solving marriage cases that only God knows the true state of affairs in some instances. All we can do is to pass on the testimony as presented, at the same time employing the safeguard laid down in law to prevent fraud.

VALIDITY, SACRAMENTALITY, DISSOLUBILITY

OF CONSUMMATED MARRIAGES, CONTRACT FOR WHICH WAS NOT ENTERED INTO BEFORE PROPER PRIEST AND TWO WITNESSES—EACH, OR ONLY ONE, OF THE PARTIES BEING CATHOLIC, AND, IF THE CASE REQUIRED, NO DISPENSATION HAVING BEEN OBTAINED FROM THE DIRIMENT IMPEDIMENT OF DISPARITY OF WORSHIP.

Time and Place of Ceremony	*Each Party Catholic*	*Catholic and certainly baptized non-Catholic*	*Catholic and doubtfully baptized non-Catholic*	*Catholic and certainly not baptized person*
Where Tametsi was not in force	Valid Sacramental Dissoluble by death Can. 1118	Valid Sacramental Dissoluble by death Can. 1118	Presumptively Valid Can. 1014 Doubtfully Sacramental Can. 1070 No. 2 Dissoluble by death Can. 1118*	Invalid by Disparity of Worship
Where Tametsi was in force without Benedictine Concession	Invalid by Clandestinity	Invalid by Clandestinity	Invalid either by Clandestinity or Disparity of Worship	Invalid by Clandestinity and Disparity of Worship
Where Tametsi was in force with the Benedictine Concession	Invalid by Clandestinity	Valid Sacramental Dissoluble by death Can. 1118	Presumptively Valid Can. 1014 Doubtfully Sacramental Can. 1070 No. 2 Dissoluble by death Can. 1118*	Invalid by Clandestinity and Disparity of Worship
Under the Ne Temere	Invalid by Clandestinity	Invalid by Clandestinity	Invalid by Clandestinity or Disparity of Worship	Invalid by Clandestinity and Disparity of Worship
Under the New Code	Invalid by Clandestinity Can. 1094	Invalid by Clandestinity Can. 1094	Invalid by Clandestinity Can. 1094 or Disparity of Worship Can. 1070	Invalid by Clandestinity Can. 1094 and Disparity of Worship Can. 1070

* See foot of p. 186, ECCL. REVIEW, Feb., 1925. Can. 1127 does not apply here.

VALIDITY, SACRAMENTALITY, DISSOLUBILITY

OF CONSUMMATED MARRIAGES OF NON-CATHOLICS "INTER SE", CONTRACT FOR WHICH WAS NOT ENTERED INTO BEFORE PROPER PRIEST AND TWO WITNESSES, AND IF THE CASE REQUIRED, NO DISPENSATION HAVING BEEN OBTAINED FROM THE DIRIMENT IMPEDIMENT OF DISPARITY OF WORSHIP.

Six Possible Combinations	*Contracted Before the Code*	*Contracted Since the Code*
Each certainly not baptized	Certainly not Sacramental Certainly valid Dissoluble only *in favorem fidei* through Pauline Privilege Can. 1120 seqq. Ordinary may act.	Certainly not sacramental Certainly valid Dissoluble only *in favor. fidei* through Pauline Privilege Can. 1120 seqq. Ordinary may act.
Each doubtfully baptized	Doubtfully Sacramental Presumptively valid, Cann. 1014–1070 No. 2. Perhaps dissoluble *in favorem fidei.* The chance of a Sacramental union may preclude the Church from interpreting the doubt in favor of marriage liberty. Ordinary may not at present act. The Holy Office should be appealed to. If their answer favors marriage liberty it will perhaps be a declaration that the Pauline Privilege is applicable (Canon 1127) instead of a "Disparity of Worship" declaration of nullity based on construing one of the baptisms valid and the other invalid.*	Doubtfully Sacramental Certainly valid Cann. 1070–1099 No. 2. Perhaps dissoluble *in favor. fidei.* The chance of a Sacramental union may preclude the Church from interpreting the doubt in favor of marriage liberty. Ordinary may not at present act. The Holy Office should be appealed to. If their answer favors marriage liberty it may be by way of a dispensation (based on construing one of the baptisms valid and the other invalid) from the presumptively natural marriage, instead of a declaration that the Pauline Privilege is applicable (Canon 1127), in this latter case each party taken to be unbaptized.
Each certainly baptized	Certainly Sacramental Certainly valid† Dissoluble only by death Can. 1118.	Certainly Sacramental Certainly valid Can. 1099 No. 2. Dissoluble only by death Can. 1118.

* Dissoluble *in favorem fidei* if contracted in Province of Santa Fe prior to *Ne Temere,* because *Tametsi* was not supplemented there by *Benedictine Concession.*

† Invalid if contracted in Province of Santa Fe prior to *Ne Temere.*

One certainly not baptized; other doubtfully baptized	Certainly not Sacramental Presumptively valid Can. 1014 Dissoluble only *in favorem fidei.* Ordinary may act, construing the baptism valid and declaring the marriage invalid because of Disparity of Worship. (If the baptism is *de facto* invalid the marriage is dissoluble anyway in virtue of the Pauline Privilege.)	Certainly not Sacramental Certainly valid, Canons 1070–1099 No. 2. Dissoluble only *in favor. fidei.* Ordinary may act, declaring the Pauline Privilege applicable by Canon 1127, and at the same time, dispensing by Canon 15 "ad cautelam" from the natural union probably present by valid baptism.
One certainly not baptized; other certainly baptized	Certainly not Sacramental Invalid because of Disparity of Worship. Ordinary may declare it invalid.	Certainly not Sacramental Certainly valid, Cann. 1070 No. 1 and 1099 No. 2. This natural marriage is dissoluble only *in favorem fidei* by Pontifical Dispensation through the Holy Office. Ordinary cannot at present grant this dispensation. (Helena Case, 5 Nov., 1924, ECCL. REV., Feb., 1925, p. 188.)
One certainly baptized; other doubtfully baptized	Doubtfully Sacramental Presumptively valid Can. 1014† Perhaps dissoluble *in favorem fidei.* The chance of a Sacramental union may preclude the Church from interpreting the doubt in favor of marriage liberty. The Holy Office should be appealed to for declaration of nullity on account of the presumptive Disparity of Worship. Ordinary may not at present act.	Doubtfully Sacramental Certainly valid, Cann. 1070 and 1099 No. 2. Perhaps dissoluble *in favorem fidei.* The chance of a Sacramental union may preclude the Church from interpreting the doubt in favor of marriage liberty. The Holy Office should be appealed to for dispensation from the presumptive natural marriage. Ordinary cannot at present grant this dispensation.

G. J. DONNELLY.

St. Louis, Mo.

SUMMARY OF AN IMPORTANT MARRIAGE CASE.

At the request of a correspondent asking for a brief statement of the recently much discussed decision of the Roman Matrimonial Court and the attending circumstances of the Castellane-Gould case, we submit the following summary of the controversy, prepared by the Rev. Dr. P. Collis, Professor of Moral Theology at Overbrook Seminary.

The complete proceedings of the first trial of the Castellane-Gould marriage case may be found in the "Decisiones S. Romanae Rotae," Vol. III, pp. 507-519. The proceedings of the second trial are printed in the same "Decisiones", Vol. V., pp. 173-195. The report of the third trial is given in the *Acta Ap. Sedis,* 1915, 292-313. The interest which the case has aroused will justify a brief account of it.

Count Boni de Castellane married Anna Gould in the Cathedral at New York, on 14 March, 1895, before Archbishop Corrigan, after a dispensation from the impediment of mixed religion had been obtained. Three children were born to them, but the marriage proved unhappy. From the third year of the marriage the wife suspected that the husband was unfaithful to her, and finally in 1906 she obtained a civil divorce from him through the Paris courts, and married another man. The Count of Castellane then decided that his marriage was invalid from the very beginning, because his wife protested both before and after the marriage that the marriage bond would in no way hinder her from obtaining a divorce if he should be unfaithful to her. The Count presented his case to the Holy Father, and asked that the Rota be made the court of first instance. The Holy Father granted the request and the Count brought before the Rota an action to have the marriage annulled on the ground that the consent given by Anna Gould was invalid, since it contained a condition that was contrary to the substance of marriage.

The first Turnus of the Rota, on which Cardinal Lega was the Ponens, on 9 December, 1911, declared that the marriage was valid, or rather that it had not been proved that it was invalid. From this decision the Count appealed to the second Turnus of the Rota. In this second trial the wife refused to

appear and was declared "contumax". The decision of the second Turnus, published on 1 March, 1913, reversed the former decision, thus declaring the marriage invalid. The Defensor Vinculi appealed *ex officio* from this decision and the case was brought before the third Turnus of the Rota. The third and ordinarily the final decision was published on 8 February, 1915. It reversed the decision of the second Turnus and hence declared that the invalidity had not been proved.

Since a marriage case never becomes a "res iudicata", the Count appealed to the Holy Father to reopen his case. The Holy Father assented and committed the case to a Commission of Cardinals who rendered their decision in March 1925, in favor of the validity of the marriage. The Count again petitioned for a reopening of the case, but in August, 1925, the Holy Father refused his request, and hence the marriage stands to-day as valid.

THE WHITE CLERICAL HABIT FOR THE SOUTH.

We have reached the days and nights of hot summer. At the suggestion of some clerical brethren who have been discussing the subject recently, as is apt to be done at retreats and occasional gatherings of the priestly fraternity, here in the South, I submit the following proposal, in the hope that it may lead to some authoritative if not official expression in favor of the white cassock for us.

Those of us who have had as class-mates American priests now laboring as missionaries in China and Korea, envy them their white cassocks, suited to the climatic conditions of hot southern climes. Since the reasons for this recognized concession to ease local hardships incident to missionary life are climatic rather than territorial, would it not be possible for our bishops in the Southern States to obtain a general permission to substitute white for black in clerical dress?

Or, could the bishop use his discretion in permitting the white habit to priests who live and labor for months together in a temperature well over the hundred-degree mark? I ask this since bishops might hesitate to give broad leave to this effect to all the priests subject to them in a particular district.

Or again—if a priest believing that his bishop, while not opposed to his clergy wearing white in place of black during the hot season, should prefer not to be asked for a concession which may seem exceptional, could such a priest presume on the privilege or seek to obtain it in some other way?

As allied with this topic I should further ask, is it lawful to adopt white as a street dress for the priest under the conditions above specified? What must a bishop do to secure the same comfort to his clergy as, according to the missionary journals, is allowed to the clergy in the hot climate of the East? I have noticed, in journeying through one of our archdioceses well above the Mason and Dixon line, that the question has apparently been solved for the local clergy in summer camps. I understand that they are out of the reach of likely disedification; but the question may in any case be viewed from the point of utility rather than convenience and ease. We of the South are not looking for privileges of a sporting tendency. Our incomes are as a rule small, and reduced expense is also a a consideration connected with wearing white in place of the more costly black. There is no more likelihood of Catholics in the South being scandalized at seeing a priest in white suit or cassock, than they are now when they meet a Dominican Friar. If any persons should be so scandalized, they can easily be shown to be unreasonable in view of the admittedly lawful custom obtaining in all Southern climates of the Catholic mission field. The fact that the dioceses in the South at present come under the general government of the Church and are no longer styled missionary does not change the climate.

The ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW will do a service to the priests below the Mason and Dixon line if it were to throw some light on the subject.

AB AUSTRO VENIENS.

The matter of distinctive clerical dress is, to judge from the ecclesiastical canons on the subject, not so much a question of color as of a marked indication of dignity and gravity, such as belong to the priest's sacred office.

Our American Bishops, who were naturally familiar with the climatic conditions in the States, apparently insist on black for clerics but with the added qualification, "ita ut a

laicis distingui possint" (Conc. Plen. Balt. III, Tit. II, n. 77). Stress is laid upon the outward form of clothing reaching below the knee. In insisting upon black, the Fathers of the Council were perhaps influenced by the Roman traditions generally, since the climate of Italy corresponds on the whole to the latitude of the United States. Moreover, the common practice in South America, despite the climate, also calls for black.

But the law of the Church does not insist upon black so much as upon the principle that clerics be recognized by the soberness of their outward habit, of which black is naturally suggestive—"ut jam a pluribus saeculis usus induxit". Hence black is mentioned in Pontifical constitutions and in diocesan regulations. Distinctly forbidden is any form of vesture that savors of vanity, frivolity, worldliness. Varied color, extreme fashion, or secular imitation are features in dress which indicate that a cleric shuns the note of his priestly calling. Sometimes there is good reason for this. Ordinarily it is a sign of an unpriestly disposition.

The general canon law simply states that the local bishop is authorized to regulate the standard of clerical dress in harmony with recognized ecclesiastical custom. Accordingly it would be quite within the province of the Ordinary to dispense under particular circumstances from the customary black robe. It is to be noted, however, that other items besides great heat of summer have contributed to the habit of the missionary white dress, as in China and tropical countries generally. Among these are constant or very frequent travel under the sun over great distances; likewise the fact that the white soutane is worn all the year round, and as a rule the white habit of the priest at once separates him from the customary popular dress of the natives. In other ways also it is a necessity rather than a convenience, as it would be with us. Still the matter is of local import in many respects, and hence open to discussion.

THE CATHOLIC CHURCH AND PROHIBITION.

To the Editor, THE ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW:

Just when it seemed that all Catholic thinkers were agreed that States have no right to decree Prohibition, the ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW (May 1926) prints a question and answer, both of them maintaining that the United States Prohibition binds in conscience because it is made by lawful authority. The real issue—what are the limits of lawful authority—is not faced.

To teach absolute obedience to lawful authority exposes you to endless and needless difficulties. The Catechism says "obey our parents *in all that is not sin*". If you leave out the limitation, children will think they are bound to tell lies when parents bid them. When Combes expelled the French Religious, an Englishman said to me, "Serves them right for not keeping the law"—the law by which the legitimate civil authority forbade them to be Religious. He thought that that law "carries a moral obligation, arising from the duty of citizens to conserve the public order and peace as regulated by lawful authority". How answer him, except by insisting that all lawful authorities are lawful only within their own sphere?

The method of Catholic theology has been to trace out what work exactly God has given by nature to the family and to the State, and what by super-nature to the Church, and thus to see the extent and the limits of the authority He gives to parents, governments, and Popes, each in their own sphere. When this is done, the ground is clear for commanding and encouraging the two virtues needed—devoted and loyal obedience to each authority within its right limits, and intrepid resistance when they overstep those limits.

The sphere and the limits of the State's authority have been traced out by Leo XIII, especially in the Encyclicals *Libertas Praestantissimum* on Human Liberty (1888), and *Rerum Novarum* on the Condition of the Working Classes (1891). In the former he says, "If, then, by anyone in authority, something be sanctioned out of conformity with the principles of right reason, and consequently hurtful to the commonwealth, *such an enactment can have no binding force of law,* as being no rule of justice, but certain to lead men away from that good

which is the very end of civil society." "But where the power to command is wanting, or *where a law is enacted contrary to reason,* or to the eternal law, or to some ordinance of God, *obedience is unlawful,* lest, while obeying man, we become disobedient to God. Thus, an effectual barrier being opposed to tyranny, the authority in the State will not have all its own way, but the interests and *rights* of all will be safeguarded—the rights of individuals, of domestic society, and of all the members of the commonwealth; all being free to live according to law *and right reason;* and in this, as we have shown, true liberty really consists" (*The Pope and the People,* 1912; pp. 109, 111). The strong sayings which I have italicized have to be reckoned with.

In appealing to right reason the Pope does not open a barren wrangle—my reason is right and yours is wrong—but he appeals to an objective body of reasoned truths which he there sets forth, which are irrefutable and carry their own conviction. These are the truths which I thought all Catholic thinkers on Prohibition had by now studied and accepted as settling the question.

The State owes its existence to the need of protecting rights. Individuals and families seeking to exercise their rights at haphazard would hinder each other, or wrong each other; whereas it is evident that reason *can* devise means for each to get his own rights and yet leave room for all others to get theirs; and that if these means be appointed by an authority which all accept, then all will get their rights in peace. This is what makes it natural and necessary for men to form States; and this too determines the State's work. Its work is to protect rights: its authority is to ensure that every man shall (1) get his rights if he chooses, (2) leave room for all others to get theirs.

If you accept this, it is at once evident that any State that attempts to destroy a *right* is doing the exact opposite of its proper work; like a father starving his child. Prohibition takes away a man's right to choose his own food and drink. Other rights that States have tried to destroy are the right to worship according to conscience; to educate one's children according to conscience; to own private property. In all cases the Catholic answer is on the same lines. Leo XIII in *Rerum*

Novarum sets it out in answer to the attack on private property. The right was born with the man: the State did not give it and cannot take it away; the State's work is to defend it and to see that it leaves room for all rights of other men.

Two side-arguments are brought in to uphold Prohibition. First, if abstinence is good when voluntary, why not when compulsory? That is, if freedom is good, why not slavery? For you are refusing to look at the issue between freedom and slavery; you pass over that and simply look at what the man did. He married, planted potatoes, drank no wine, all because he chose. Would they not be just as good a life if he had been forced to do them by the State? The answer we have seen: States are meant to secure, not wives nor work nor diet, but free exercise of rights. The other argument is from crises and emergencies: Could there *never* be a case when the State could lawfully take away a right—e. g. the right to choose one's own diet? Could there be a case when a father might lawfully deny his child all food save milk and soda water? There could, in fever, or in famine: when the care of essential things, of life itself, requires the denial of all other choices that could endanger life. The State too has such crises: revolution, plague, famine. But you cannot argue that the rights which had to be suspended in the crisis may therefore be abolished permanently; and make the child live the rest of his life on soda and milk.

J. B. McLAUGHLIN, O.S.B.

Carlisle, England.

Resp. Apart from its somewhat oracular tone, the foregoing communication offers little that is new or that is different from the statement mentioned as made in our May number. In that issue we were at pains to stress the obligation of maintaining public order and of avoiding disedification in the face of an enacted law, whereas our foreign correspondent is concerned mainly with the defence of sacrosanct personal privilege and liberty in the abstract. His vantage-point is that of one who descries in the distance a threatened and possible invasion of one's natural rights, and not the position of a national in whose country the threat has by due process of legislation been enacted into a law of the land. In the latter

case there are questions of the people's welfare and public order to be considered, and of scandal, and of misunderstanding. There are animosities and strong prejudices, and politicians' pretences to complicate the issue.

A forthright statement of the plain principles governing the conscience phase of the question is all very well. But it may easily offend by saying what is out of due time, as one does harm by giving too strong meat to children of immature digestion. It is to be borne in mind too that, even among those whose motives are unimpugnable, whose experience is wide, and who are not to be classed too easily as partisans, there are serious men who believe that our present social conditions warrant the drastic measure of Prohibition. Whether they are justified or not in this verdict, or whether they were right or not in working to have the law passed, is a debatable proposition. What is not debatable is that Prohibition is not to be openly defied, but publicly obeyed and enforced. Common decency, order and good citizenship, and the welfare of the country (*salus reipublicae*) demand that much at least.

THE SANCTUS CANDLE AT MASS.

Qu. Some of our pastors hold to the practice of lighting a candle at the Sanctus at low Mass, and extinguishing it after Communion. I understand that the rubrics prescribe this practice; but if it is obligatory most of us are ignorant of the fact, since Mass is celebrated nearly everywhere without a Sanctus Candle. What is to be said about it?

Resp. The rubric prescribing that an additional candle be lit at low Mass, to indicate the presence on the altar, after consecration, of the Most Blessed Sacrament, was introduced during the ages of faith. It was to serve as a signal for those who entered the church that reverent genuflection was due in approaching the altar at which Mass was being celebrated, and where otherwise the Holy Eucharist was not reserved. Accordingly the *Ritus celebrandi Missam* in missals published under the authority of the Council of Trent contained a rubric providing for the Sanctus Candle, which was to be extinguished after the Communion. But the recently revised editions of the missal omit this rubric when speaking of the *Ritus cele-*

brandi Missam (Tit. VIII, n. 6). Nevertheless, in enumerating later on the things to be prepared for furnishing the altar we find the statement that "a parte Epistolae paretur cereus ad Elevationem Sacramenti accendendus" (Tit. XX).

It is therefore presumably not a matter of prescribed ritual to light the Sanctus Candle, but a laudable custom to provide a means by which the faithful entering the church, while Mass is going on, are immediately made aware of the part—before or after Consecration—in the Mass at which they are about to assist. In big churches, where several Masses are being said at the same time, the Sanctus Candle serves frequently to indicate the opportunities of fulfilling the Sunday precept or of receiving Communion.

Ecclesiastical Library Table

RECENT BIBLE STUDY.

The denial of objective divine revelation involves modern rationalism in the impossible task of exhibiting the unique belief of the ancient Hebrews as a purely natural development. No such attempt, of course, has proved satisfactory. The erection of a new hypothesis has lately been essayed by Prof. Rudolf Kittel, of the University of Leipzig, perhaps most generally known as the author of a critical edition of the Massoretic text of the Old Testament. His latest work[1] is given us in clear and readable English, wherein it fares better than many writings of his countrymen. Dr. Kittel's professed emphasis is upon the influence of Canaanite principles on the Hebrew system. It was just due time for the archeological data of this newly-explored field to be enlisted in the service of some constructive historical theory. Moreover, the available history itself, from Josue to Samuel, is redolent of Canaanitic influence on the Israelite invaders of Palestine. The periods of this influence are viewed by the sacred historians as acknowledged states of corruption and apostasy. Dr. Kittel would show that their own faith, even from long before the Exodus, was more deeply indebted to such sources than they realized.

Many of the author's postulates were to be expected. To him the Hebrews were originally a heterogenous group, and their religion a syncretism; their earliest historical records are "sagas"; the original account of the Balaam incident is not earlier than the reign of Saul; Deuteronomy is contemporary with Jeremias, and so on. One must presuppose Wellhausen in general. On the other hand there are reactions against pan-Babylonian recklessness, and historical substrata are conceded in many sections to which other critics have denied all basis in fact.

The opening chapters are a bewildering torrent of statements appealing to the comparative study of primitive religions. Even at a second or third reading the thread of their

[1] *The Religion of the People of Israel.* By Dr. Rudolf Kittel, Professor at the University of Leipzig. Authorized translation by R. Caryl Micklem. New York: Macmillan, 1925.

tendency is hard to trace, and when it begins to be evident its earlier fastenings seem suspiciously insecure. Of course, due allowance should be made in appraising a theory which professes to cover the broadest phenomena of Hebrew history within the limits of a volume like this. One would not demand detailed evidence for every step of the argument. Still, its basic postulates should be firmly grounded; and this condition is not satisfied. On the contrary, after all due allowance has been made, fact, probability and mere conjecture are handled so indiscriminately that a general aspect of historical unsoundness disfigures what is otherwise an interesting piece of constructive study.

In primitive Canaan Dr. Kittel finds a naturalistic polydemonism supreme. Every field, tree, spring or other natural asset of man had its *baal* ("lord", "owner", "possessor"), which was conceived as an "impersonal spirit-being". This entity had to be propitiated by gifts of appropriate produce, which were laid at some fitting spot for the baal to receive to its (impersonal) self. This baal-cult of nature, we are told, persisted as the common man's religion, while loftier concepts were attained by the more enlightened class. For there was a Canaanite pantheon or hierarchy of gods proper. Into its ranks, however, the baal-idea introduced unseen owners and directors of sun, moon and other superior physical forces, so that in Canaan these superior entities were not mere personifications of the forces involved, but sublimations of the original petty demons. This class became the gods best known to us from ancient Canaan. But these promoted baals were now grown too superior to fetch away their presents from the surface of the earth, or even of a "high place". Hence the adoption of burnt-offerings, whereby the gift might ascend in sacrificial smoke to the presence of the deified baal.

Here arises our first sense of serious lack, for when, where and how the notion of divinity itself arose Dr. Kittel makes no effort to determine. This presupposed, however, he sees in the use of burnt-offerings "the first step towards the spiritualization, or at least the disembodiment, of the Godhead" (p. 36). One would have thought this already secure in the deification of an impersonal spirit. Anyway, Dr. Kittel's conclusion is that, under the guidance of the better minds, Canaan-

itic polydemonism became polytheism. Yet further: even before the advent of the Hebrew patriarchs there was "a spiritual upper stratum among the Canaanites which was, at heart, in many respects strongly inclined to the *el*-faith of the early Israelites; indeed, in one regard they went still further, in that they not only looked upon their god as the highest in contrast with all others, but also as a higher unity embracing all the individual gods" (p. 47). Now, this final *universale a parte rei,* this godhead comprehending gods, and not a single and sole Divine Person, is what elsewhere appears as Dr. Kittel's own concept of strict monotheism, though it tempts one to ask how he would define pantheism. Here, at all events, in advance of any Israelite influence, he sees coexistent in Canaan popular polydemonism, spiritualized polytheism, henotheism equal to that of "the early Israelites", and even what he himself would apparently call monotheism. Canaan's religious evolution is therefore already complete; anything one can find in subsequent Hebrew belief need only be referred to its appropriate origin here. But where is the evidence of all this, and especially of the last two stages alleged?

Canaan thus prepared, the patriarchs arrive. They are introduced as having already attained to henotheism, the exaltation and special appropriation of one god without denying the existence of others. This is supported by the argument that *El,* the generic term for "a divinity", was to them a sufficiently proper name for their God, i. e. He whom they worshipped was "God" *par excellence,* others not being denied but simply neglected. When and where Abraham had arrived at this henotheistic attitude is not indicated, nor does the argument employed avail to exclude monotheism itself from his belief. But Dr. Kittel is convinced that the patriarch had something further to learn in Canaan. For under the influence of the "few deeply penetrating minds in Canaan at this time" (p. 33), the Hebrew immigrants learned to retain the plural noun *elohim* ("Gods"), and yet to treat it, in their "sagas", as grammatically singular. "By this means the Hebrews sought to explain that this plural is merely a matter of form: God is singular" (p. 33). This is certainly a novel explanation of the proper noun *Elohim* as used in the Old Testament. Moreover, one wonders how the landless nomads Abraham,

Isaac and Jacob (whose closest allies are expressly related to have been Hittites and Philistines scarcely more urbane in culture than themselves) happened within the sphere of influence of the "few deeply penetrating minds", so as to become happily initiated into the Canaanitic (and Kittelian) concept of monotheism itself.

The phraseology of the Pentateuch moreover reveals some of the attributes of this "El of the fathers" with whom Moses was later to identify the austere Yahweh. As "El living and seeing" (Gen. 16:14), He was a helper and a hearer of prayer. As "El eternal" (Gen. 21:33) and "El almighty" (Gen. 17:1, 28:3, et al.), it does not surprise Dr. Kittel that He sometimes became even "El the most high" (Gen. 14:22), like the God of Melchisedech. Thus, as the culmination of His attributes, "He towers above all the other *elim,* whose existence, however, was not denied" (p. 43). But here, unfortunately for the orderly process of events, the mysterious truth of the unity of godhead acquired by the patriarchs from "the few deeply penetrating minds" vanishes again into a mere henotheism, and the evolution becomes a retrogression. However, from these titles and other data of the patriarchal "sagas" we learn that El of the fathers was "a *personal* Godhead, a kindly and accessible helper, and at the same time a protector and a chastiser who towered above the limits of human time and power and indeed above other divine beings. Thus we cannot be surprised at the gentleness and kindliness with which the God, even where he is not called *el,* communicates with Abraham and his other worshippers. And even where, as in the case of Jacob at Jabbok, he still bears traces of a wild river-spirit, and thus reminds us of his ancient connexion with such, here, too, he becomes a kindly being who does not part from mankind without bestowing a blessing" (pp. 43-44). Benignancy, then, cannot have been an impossible note of a demon-baal, if demoniac truculence was compatible even with the nature of El of the fathers; and again, "where he is not called *el,*" how can he be just as appropriately entitled Yahweh by some later disciple of Moses, without straightway forfeiting his "gentleness and kindliness"? An element of this same period is alleged to be the patriarchs' positive rejection of the Canaanites' chief divinity Baal, for which, however,

Dr. Kittel draws his only evidence (and that very indirect) from a single comparison of two phrases in the Book of Judges. If the argument from silence, highly prized by this author, is worth anything here, the absence of all explicit evidence would seem to indicate that the Canaanite Baal was rather unknown and neglected by Abraham, Isaac and Jacob than consciously repudiated. But if, on the other hand, such was the fate of Baal at their hands, why not also that of "the other gods, whose existence was not denied"? Such inconsistencies run riot through the entire work.

To Dr. Kittel, of course, there was no single migration into Egypt of the whole ancestry of Israel, such as the "Joseph-saga" relates. Israelite tribes already distinguished by their familiar names were early settled in Canaan; some of them were pushed southward, and some, again, of these made their way to Goshen in Egypt, where they mingled with Egyptian and Bedawi inhabitants. What became of the remaining Hebrews in Canaan, or why twelve tribes are related to have emerged from Egypt at the Exodus, we are not informed. But the Exodus itself was rendered possible by a new stage in Israel's religious development. A great leader, Moses, presented himself as the messenger of one Yahweh, and by a series of fortunate coincidences accomplished the escape of the whole nation from Egypt under very extraordinary circumstances. This established Yahweh's prestige and Moses' commission at a single stroke. At this crisis Dr. Kittel again disappoints us: there is no telling where Moses discovered Yahweh. But his personal experience of this divinity was deep and convincing, and he was able to impress it upon his mystified countrymen, and even to identify Yahweh with El of the fathers, in defiance of a most conspicuous discrepancy between the two. For the new claimant, thinks Dr. Kittel, was more like an exalted nature-demon than the kindly and familiar guide of the patriarchs. Yahweh was the terrible wielder of the elements, a very spirit of the wilderness. He imposed many a "tabu" upon his followers under the heaviest penalties. He exacted swift vengeance of the negligent,—even (we are boldly assured) without previous warning. But in spite of this forbidding disposition, Yahweh makes his very first appearance as an ethical God, who rules the mind and will

by effectual sanctions, obliges the conscience, and knows no worship or service inseparable from principles of conduct. Only a Moses could have imposed so profound an innovation upon this horde of liberated serfs, and at the same time succeeded in persuading them that this new Lord was indeed "the El of their fathers". And yet Dr. Kittel's antithesis might suffer marked modification if, on the one hand, El of the fathers were studied in his attitude to Sodom and Gomorrhah and to Onan, and, on the other hand, Yahweh were contemplated in the manna, the quails, the smitten rock and the restoration of the wantonly-broken covenant. Perhaps the Israelites themselves found the two personalities not unlike.

The Covenant itself is explained as the merest accident in the world. Shortly after the Exodus a halt was made at Marah, where, after the waters had been divinely healed of their bitterness, a binding agreement with Yahweh as Healer of His people was concluded by certain "statutes and ordinances". This is the record of Exodus (15:25), and antedates the arrival at Sinai and the formal ratification there of the Covenant in its complete substance. Now, far in the north of the Sinai peninsula, though south of Palestine itself, lay Kadesh ("sacred"), also called En-Mishpat ("judgment-spring": Gen. 14:7). Without deigning a word of explanation, Dr. Kittel first assumes that Marah was really Kadesh or En-Mishpat. Next he supposes that Bedawin commonly repaired to the "judgment-spring" to arrange inter-tribal disputes; but since this could not take place except under a truce, the judgment-spring must have been the customary scene of treaties or covenants. Thirdly, he assures us that the Israelites while in Goshen had belonged to such Bedawi confederations, and knew the spot in this association. Whence he concludes that the liberated tribes, finding themselves halted here, quite naturally embraced the opportunity to enter into a covenant—not with one another, but with Yahweh! Looser reasoning would be hard to devise,—but stay: this is scientific historical research. Accordingly, we have the terrible nature-god later revealing himself at Sinai apparently for nothing; for though the oral tradition of the Book of the Covenant (Ex. 20-23) goes back, by a generous concession, to Moses, we have no inkling when and where he delivered even this nucleus (un-

less at the "judgment-spring" before arriving at Sinai); while, of course, the bulk of "the so-called Mosaic Law" was "the work of constant development" as "everybody knows" (p. 56).

At all events, Moses became a religious founder of the first rank. "Yahweh became a God of the moral will, the Yahweh-religion became an *ethical religion*. Its worship was not merely monolatry, the service of one God only, but its conception of God, although not as yet the ethical monotheism of the prophets, was nevertheless a national and ethical henotheism. Yahweh was not yet for Moses as for his great successors a world-God, but certainly he was an ethical national God, lord and protector of an ethical national order, and the way was prepared for ethical monotheism" (p. 63). This, however, involves Dr. Kittel in fresh difficulty. He sees a "coalescence of two ideas" in that El of the fathers had, after all, been "El the most high", while Yahweh also was supreme God to His own people. Hence he concludes that "the inheritance from the patriarchs co-operated in the spiritualizing of the savage and terrible *tabu* of the wilderness-God of Sinai" (p. 58). But this very sublimation of a nature-demon creates a paradox, since its effect is not to produce a deified baal of thunder, lightning and wind, but quite to surpass all this. "God, so far from being a mere force within nature, became the one who ruled over nature: 'he smote the Red Sea, then was it dry.' The nature religion had been overthrown at least in principle" (p. 55). One would have thought the nature-religion would merely have been raised to an universal scale for all localities alike. Singular, too, that if this God ruled over nature in its most powerful and universal aspects, he was "not yet a world-God".

Nowhere, however, is Dr. Kittel so little convincing as when at length he gets the Israelites into Canaan. Asserting two opposite aspects in the nature of Yahweh, and observing that they were bound to conflict, he proceeds to establish the determining influence of Canaanitic polydemonism on the final conception of Yahweh. Pages of evidence are marshaled to exhibit periods of corruption which the Book of the Judges has as well described and better estimated. The greater portion of the nation, according to Dr. Kittel, submitted to Yahweh's

degradation to the status of a local baal. The proof? Every startling anthropomorphism, even from the earliest books, is dragged forth to attest that "the Yahwist" represents his God as ignorant of human doings without personal inspection, as capricious, passionate, envious, anxious, insanely irritable, and even given to leading men astray in order to smite them for straying. If these manifest figures of speech—the common man's only way of describing the moral dealings of the Infinite—are to be taken *sensu proprio,* why are equally analogous descriptions of "gentleness and kindliness" exalted into attributes of "El the most high", instead of being recognized as "the Yahwist's" marks of a fairly beneficent baal? The rule should work both ways, especially since a baal (although an "impersonal spirit") could, after all, be "propitiated". But stranger still: Dr. Kittel admits that a chosen few always resisted, though ineffectually, this baalizing of Yahweh under Canaanitic influence. Then why in the name of any calculation was the "Yahwist", that unknown but transcendent literary genius, not among those few, that he should write thus of Yahweh? Had he too succumbed?

To pursue the remainder of the study would be superfluous. We learn that the prophets finally saved the desperate situation by evolving a real ethical monotheism under the stresses of political crises. This conjecture, familiar enough in other connexions, serves Dr. Kittel as an eventual eraser of the blots of Canaanitic baalism from the faith of the Old Testament. He does not seem to notice that it is to Yahweh of the Exodus and to the sanctity of His Covenant that the prophets are forever appealing. That they emphasize His prerogatives as "a world-God" is as natural as it is evident. Other gods had not called for explicit denial until they began to receive express acknowledgment. But if the prophets were the first to arrive at this truth, its introduction as a solvent into the political medleys of their age was, to say the least, a strange policy, and less effectual than any other. Had Yahweh's exclusive divinity never been heard of before in Israel, it was never harder to believe than just then.

Notwithstanding the profound reverence which this age of mental independence pays to the authority of a name and a chair, the degree of serious attention due to works of this class

in general, and to Dr. Kittel's production in particular, comes sharply into question when one reads such remarks as the following: "But just as the saint comes to be worshipped instead of God, so many people among the masses could misuse the serpent," etc. (p. 77). Without even the need of investigating facts, everyone realizes that a saint cannot be known or thought of except as a servant of God, and that consequently not even the most ignorant of men can perform the mental prodigy of worshipping a saint in God's stead. The above-cited phrase nevertheless adorns no Lutheran tract or catechism, but a serious work of scholarly pretensions. It is not noted here because of its inherent offensiveness and malice, but simply as an index of mentality. If this be the measure of Dr. Kittel's acquaintance with contemporary belief and practice, what can be the value of his judgment in reconstructing the cultus of a distant past?

And the Old Testament is still with us to be explained anew. Its story is too simple, self-consistent and plausible to be accepted as it stands; to take that unique literature at its word would be "naive", "short-sighted", "unscientific", or even worse. It tells of One who made man what he was, and then set patiently about the longer task of rescuing him from what he had chosen to become. It both narrates and also exhibits an evolution unparalleled indeed, because it is the graded schooling of an all-wise Teacher. No step in the process is inopportune; all moves pace for pace with those unfolding capacities of mind and will in man which are first its own hard-won effect and then its fresh opportunity. And the marvel is that each chapter in the long curriculum is written in the terms which its own peculiar lesson might involve; that this story of educative providence is silent where the Teacher Himself, supposing its truth, would have been silent, and speaks where He would have spoken; and that nevertheless it is maintained to be the product of innumerable fragments pieced together centuries late by historical and religious inventors. Such is the moral miracle that men will postulate and then attempt to establish, rather than believe that God Himself has been the Teacher.

WILLIAM H. MCCLELLAN, S.J.

Woodstock, Maryland.

Criticisms and Notes

THE LIFE AND TIMES OF BISHOP ULLATHORNE, 1806—1889. By Dom Cuthbert Butler, Benedictine of Downside Abbey. Two volumes. Burns, Oates & Washbourne, London; Benziger Brothers, New York, Cincinnati, Chicago. Pp. vi—368 and 332.

The figure of Archbishop Ullathorne completes the magnificent symposium of notable churchmen in England during the Victorian era, recalling to mind the Patristic ages of great saints and classical writers. Manning and Newman, interpreters of the aims of Catholic revival in England from different points of view and with apparently mutually opposing temperaments, are here lifted above the mists of misunderstanding by a thoughtful historian of the Church who furnishes a link which brings their virtues into truer relief than has so far been done. For two generations Ullathorne was the friend, we might say the intimate, of both Manning and Newman. The mutual respect which these men bore each other excluded commonplace sentiment and every trace of that subserviency which frequently marks egotism in capable men. While in the controversy between Wiseman and the English bishops Ullathorne withstood Manning, he found it possible to do so without losing respect for his adversary or of forfeiting the respect of his opponent. This biographer can therefore say of Manning and Ullathorne, that they were able to work together "even in opposition, harmoniously" (II, 123).

To Newman, Bishop Ullathorne had first been introduced a few days before being consecrated in the church which he had built at Coventry. A short time before, this place had been a poor country mission. But the insignificant little chapel did not hinder the young pastor from looking after stray sheep, and some two months later he received twelve converts into the faith. This gives some idea of the rapid change that took place under his pastoral administration. He was then thirty-five years of age, having previously labored among the convicts in Australia, where he had been sent at his own request. It is noteworthy at the time of his actual consecration that, though it was he who had advocated the establishment of a hierarchy for Australia, with Sydney as metropolitan, he had already refused four proffered mitres, urged upon him at Rome. Finally his repugnance broke and he accepted the position of Apostolic Vicar. Newman with some of the converts came over from Oscott, where the nucleus of the future Birmingham Oratory had gathered, to Coventry for the ceremony.

For a time the Western District over which Ullathorne presided was administered from Prior Park. The house had been opened by

his predecessor as a seminary and college. Here the Bishop with the Vicar General, who was also rector of the institution, resided. The latter, Dr. Brindle, had made a very favorable impression on the Oxford men who had visited the place. "He is a gentleman in the true sense of the word," Newman wrote. "The place is not perhaps a school of perfection, but of sensible religion" (I, 141). But Ullathorne during his first month of residence came to the conclusion that "the administration was inefficient, and that if there was to be any hope of extricating the establishment, the staff should be reconstituted." The removal of Dr. Brindle as rector and Vicar General caused hardships for the young bishop, and while later on they assumed new forms, they did not wholly cease.

Meanwhile he became the instrument for the reëstablishment of the Hierarchy in England under Wiseman as the first Archbishop of Westminster. Ullathorne was appointed to Birmingham, where he found Faber and Newman in residence. On occasion of the bishop's meeting these men, difficulties arose between them, which had the effect of interrupting the publication of the "Lives of Modern Saints" on which the future Oratorians had been engaged. But Newman and Ullathorne came to understand each other, and created a close friendship which lasted and intensified with the years to the end of their lives.

Thus the biography of Ullathorne throws a new and quite satisfying light upon the two great Cardinals, bringing into relief the strength and beauty of their characters in both their differences and their antagonisms, so as to make the latter strong shadow lines, as in a splendidly expressive engraving. There is a simplicity and straightforwardness in the story which Dom Cuthbert tells that makes it run on like a limpid stream, refreshing the reader with a sense of the sincerity shown alike in the subject and its treatment.

This Life of Ullathorne, the third in the group of great churchmen during the last century in England, does much more than illustrate and explain the individual history of the two Cardinals or the influence they exerted on each other and their contemporaries. The two volumes constitute a complete chapter in the history of the Church inasmuch as they supplement and complete Bishop Bernard Ward's *History of Catholicity in England*. The latter had reached only the days when the Hierarchy was reëstablished. Wiseman has been credited with that important act, but the reader of this biography will come to know how much of the power behind the throne lodged in Ullathorne, who was the real agent, though without a trace of the ecclesiastical politician about him. Beyond this, Dom Butler reveals to us in this biography the spiritual likeness of a great soul, deeply humble and ever ready to serve at a personal sacrifice even when he seemed to command.

We have had revelations of the inner life of Bishop Ullathorne from capable pens before. Mother Francis Raphael, that singularly generous and spiritual-minded nun, better known as Augusta Theodosia Drane, of whom Ullathorne himself wrote, "she is one of those many-sided characters who can write, draw a picture, guide other souls, superintend a building, rule an Order, and the like with equal facility and success," has left us a picture of him. It was at her instigation, on the occasion of the death of Mother Margaret Hallahan, in 1868, at the Stone convent, that the Bishop was induced to write his autobiography. Her urging was based upon the undeniable fact that his priestly and episcopal activity was bound up with persons and events of importance and so was necessary for a correct appreciation of the religious history of the time. Accordingly he wrote the story of his own life. But if he furnishes the scaffolding of the edifice it is merely for the purpose of exhibiting the spiritual beauty of those with whom he came in contact. Regarding his own activity, he strictly adheres to the exterior life. Later on Mother Drane procured the publication of Bishop Ullathorne's numerous letters. They made up a stately volume in which was seen the interior life of the man portrayed as no other medium could have depicted it. Still there was missing the proper synthesis for their fuller interpretation and the filling-in of lacunae which Mother Raphael was unable to do. This is what is supplied by Dom Butler's biography of Ullathorne, and in a way which makes the work a classical tribute to one of England's great churchmen. It is noteworthy too in this connexion that in Ullathorne flowed the blood of Blessed Thomas More. The book presents a pleasant and edifying tale of combined action between Wiseman, Errington, Newman, Manning, Clifford, Vaughan, all notable characters and influences in the shaping of the history of England's noble band of Victorian churchmen. The qualities of patience, humility, and the value of self-discipline, about which Ullathorne wrote so eloquently, are brought out with vivid colors in almost every chapter of this admirable picture of a true priest and capable bishop. The illustrations add much to the attraction of these two welcome volumes.

MASS STIPENDS. By the Rev. Charles Frederick Keller, S.T.B., J.C.D. B. Herder Book Co., St. Louis, Mo. and London. 1926. Pp. 198.

The subject of Mass stipends has been prominently brought to the attention of the general public by the impoverished condition of priests in the countries afflicted through the late European war; also by the increased interest in the needs of the missionaries in the East. The appeals which have as a consequence been circulated indiscrimi-

nately "for Mass intentions", by way of charitable relief and in return for community prayers and ecclesiastical privileges and indulgences, while avoiding the prohibition technically of "traffic in stipends", are calculated to leave the impression of negotiating in a measure with the popular sentiment of piety. There is something odious in the expressed offer, "Give me money, that I may pray for you or get my friends to do it". The terms of the solicitation have an air of perfunctoriness which suggests traffic rather than the spontaneous desire of a faithful soul to obtain intercession with God through the ministry of priestly sacrifice. Dr. Keller corrects the translation of Canon 827 by the writer of *The New Canon Law* which reads: "any kind of negotiation or trading with Mass stipends must absolutely be avoided", by saying that the Canon rather seems to mean: "even the appearance of negotiation or trading should be kept away from Mass stipends" (p. 80). Clear notions touching the practice and legitimacy of Mass stipends are manifestly not superfluous, and Dr. Keller helps us to get them by summarizing and interpreting the legislation, as well as by indicating the abuses to be avoided which the history of the matter, like that of Indulgences, shows to be a temptation in practices of devotion otherwise legitimate and laudable. The book, which is an enlargement of a doctorate thesis already commented upon in these pages, is carefully and succinctly written to serve the clerical reader.

PROPHETS, PRIESTS AND PUBLICANS, Character Sketches and Problems from the Gospels. By J. P. Arendzen, M.A. Cantab., D.Ph., D.D. Sands & Co., London and Edinburgh. B. Herder, St. Louis, Mo. 1926. Pp. 336.

Doubtless many who have found in the abundant literature with which non-Catholic writers have enriched the historical background of the Bible with so much interesting information, have sometimes wished that books by our own Scriptural scholars on similar lines were more plentiful. Works like Geikie's *Hours with the Bible, Hours with the New Testament,* the same author's *Life of Christ,* Edersheim's *Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah,* are types of the sort of literature referred to. Although not every statement set down in such books can be unqualifiedly approved by the Catholic mind, they do contain a very large mass of interesting material that throws a fresh and vivid light on the historical and local setting of the Sacred Writings and one that makes for a more intimate understanding of divine revelation. Of course we are by no means lacking in such supplementary aids to the Bible. The scholarly works of Fr. Pope, the splendid series of volumes by the Abbé Fouard, the graphic

and at the same time erudite *Life of Our Lord* by the French Bishop Le Camus, are treasures for which Catholics may be grateful. On the other hand the list is not so long but that we may easily find a warm welcome for an addition such as is made by the book before us. The volume comprises a series of essays which supplements a former collection by the same author entitled *The Gospels, Fact, Myth or Legend.*

The first part on the *Credibility of the Gospels,* dealing as it does with certain exegetical problems, carries forward the general line and purpose of the earlier volume. The second and the much longer portion treating of *New Testament Times* puts the volume in the category of those books illustrative of the historical environment to which allusion was made above. In the first of the series of sixteen chapters the reader is brought into intimate contact with the mind of the Jew and the Gentile who were looking for the Messias. In the second he is introduced to the life, the character, the mission of the Baptist. In the third he learns many interesting details concerning the Scribes. The famous Rabbis Hillel and Schammai, and their respective teachings, the Pharisees, Sadducees, Samaritans, the Publicans, the Coin of the Tribute, Judas the Iscariot, and a number of the other Gospel characters who were instrumental in bringing about the death of our Lord — around these central figures is thrown a wealth of detailed information collected from the Sacred Writings and supplemented from the Apocrypha, Josephus, the Talmuds, and other Rabbinical as well as pagan sources. Vivid side-lights are thus turned on the Gospels which, by illuminating the local and temporal conditions wherein the various Biblical personages lived and acted out their respective roles, add a fresh interest to the sacred story and thus by making the concrete setting more actual facilitate the spiritual assimilation of the divine message. The series closes with two chapters on the Church in the New Testament and the Priests of the New Law — critical essays which the clergy will find suggestive for instructional purposes.

THE BOOK OF LIFE. By Benedict Williamson. With a Foreword by The Right Rev. Henry G. Graham, Bishop of Tipasa. Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner & Co., Ltd., London. B. Herder, St. Louis, Mo. 1926. Pp. viii-278.

The *Book of Life* is the Life of Jesus Christ, the Son of God. Fr. Williamson seeks to make that Book so plain and simple that humble souls may easily understand and appreciate its meaning and spiritual value. This of course is in one or other way the object and purpose of every writer who endeavors to draw out the divine story

from the condensed form in which the four Evangelists present it. Each writer does it in his individual method and style. Fr. Williamson's way is to follow the leading events of our Lord's life, dwell on the various localities, times, circumstances in which they occur, the personages active therein, and so on. The *leit-motif* that sounds throughout is *Hic est Filius Dei* and *Deus est charitas*. The work becomes thus a spiritual treatise which devout souls will find serviceable whether for meditation or pious reading.

SCIENCE AND THE MODERN WORLD. Lowell Lectures, 1925. By Alfred North Whitehead, Sc.D., Professor of Philosophy, Harvard University. The Macmillan Co., New York. 1925. Pp. 296.

THE METAPHYSICAL FOUNDATIONS OF MODERN PHYSICAL SCIENCE. An Historical and Critical Essay. By Edwin A. Burtt, Ph.D., Assistant Professor of Philosophy in the University of Chicago. Harcourt, Brace & Co., New York. 1925. Pp. 357.

Perhaps the time will come — though at present it seems indefinitely remote—when "science" and "metaphysics" as represented in these two books—which, for the rest, are sufficiently typical of a growing class of more or less kindred publications — and the same terms as embodied in the traditional philosophy — the *philosophia perennis*—will reach some reciprocal understanding. It were vain to hope for agreement, albeit some on our side are optimistic enough to see in the trend of the New Realists toward the objectivity of ideas an indication of a *rapprochement* from the party of the other side.

Science in that Philosophy has a well-defined meaning. So has *Metaphysics,* a member of the philosophical organism. In books like these at hand the terms are used with the vaguest sort of connotation and a most elastic application. But what makes an *entente cordiale* the more hopeless is the fact that thinkers of the class above represented would have the triumph distinctive of "modern thought" consist in its having on the one hand completely "scrapped" Scholastic Metaphysics or, as Professor Whitehead calls it, "medieval rationalism", and on the other hand having created a wholly new and an entirely opposite world-view. The medieval world-view which holds God's self-revelation to be the supreme *extrinsic* purpose of the world and of man, and the supreme intrinsic purpose to be the highest perfection (which includes ultimate though conditioned happiness) of man individually and collectively taken—this world-view "modern thought" either denies outright or ignores; and this mainly because the idea of absolute finality has been lost; just as

the idea of absolute beginning, creation, was lost by the ancients, outside of Jewry, and though refound through Christianity has been relost by modern philosophy. In place of this world-view "modern thought" has nothing definite to substitute, but seems, if not quite satisfied, at least resigned to content itself with speculations on etherial vortices, protons, and electrons; on the spatio-temporal formations of the organized patterns amongst the ultimate corpuscles; on the infinitesimal segmentations and the fragmental vehicularities of the germ-plasm in hereditarial transmissions; on the mechanical synthetizations of bio-chemisms; on the neural complexes which, seen from the inside, it calls *consciousness,* aggregates or "streams" whereof are supposed to constitute Mind, or what the simple or religious-minded folk call Soul. *Et reliqua.*

The two volumes above contain a mass of speculations on these and kindred facts or phenomena—phenomena which *in re* are truly wonderful and doubtless of much importance for their possible bearing upon some future interpretation of the cosmos. But please do not nobilitate such speculations with the title of *Science* or philosophy. *Scientific* they may be, and in some vague sense *metaphysical.* This and nothing more.

It is to be noted that both these books deal with the rise and development of physical science. The first endeavors to explain the general modern empirical mentality as a reaction against the rational (rationalistic?) interpretation of man and the world characteristic of the Middle Ages. The intellectual tendencies resulting from that reaction are traced through the seventeenth century—"the century of genius"—down to our own day. The ideas and viewpoints outstanding in these tendencies are set forth with a concurrent critical commentary. Aspects of their bearings on religion and on certain social problems are likewise considered.

The second work above covers the same epoch, but, as its sub-title suggests, the historico-scientific current is the more prominent feature in the scenario. Copernicus, and Kepler, Galileo, Descartes, Hobbes, More, Barrow, Gilbert, Boyle, and last of all and mainly Sir Isaac Newton—the discoveries and philosophico-scientific opinions of these typical thinkers are passed under review.

It would be quite impossible within the limits set for this notice to offer any more detailed exposition of either one or other, much less of both works. Neither of them—least of all the second—shows any accurate knowledge either of what there was of medieval physical science or of medieval philosophy, of which there was and is a wealth. Neither writer gives any sign of having consulted either the original or any derivative source of reliable information in these departments. Consequently the allusions thereto are either most

superficial, erroneous, or ridiculous. Their expositions of modern science are on the whole informative and interesting. Both books are types of speculation with which the Catholic philosopher should be acquainted if he would understand or work in touch with his contemporaries.

If obscurity be a sign of profundity it would be hard to find a deeper stream of thought than that which flows through *Science and the Modern World*. In many places the present explorer after repeated soundings has been unable to find bottom. Accordingly he has marked them in the hope that his future efforts may be more successful. They occur at pages 99, 101, 102, 124, 149, 168, 170, and elsewhere. Had he space to spare he would quote some of these profounder difficulties with the hope that his more penetrating readers might be able to dive to deeper depths. On the other hand, however, citations might only serve to reveal his own obtusity. He will therefore content himself with referring his readers to the pages indicated and assuring them generally that the text will supply them with plenty of vigorous exercise, which is always beneficial to the mind, especially when it is exerted upon as worthy an object as *Science and the Modern World*.

Literary Chat

The part of the Sacrament of Penance called Satisfaction is the one that receives the least attention in our theological text books. The reason is, of course, obvious. No great amount of information and no special penetration seems thought to be necessary in order that a confessor may decide upon what kind or degree of atonement is *obligatory* on the penitent. Perhaps this is a rather off-hand and superficial view of the matter. That it is so and that the subject presents many more recondite elements than show themselves on the surface will become evident to the student who will read *Tractatus de Satisfactione Sacramentali quem scripsit in usum Confessariorum* P. Thomas Villanova a Zeil, O.M.Cap. In a brochure booklet of just a hundred pages, the learned Capuchin theologian treats the subject from many important aspects both on the side of the confessor and the penitent. The whole is a dissertation replete with theological science luminously conveyed and of practical and spiritual significance. Students of theology and confessors will get many fruitful suggestions from its pages. (Rauch, Innsbruck, Pustet, N. Y.)

The clergy who have read Fr. Robert Kane's *Sermon of the Sea* or his other addresses or essays will not need to be reminded that the gifted Jesuit orator, though his bodily eyes be closed to the outside world, possesses—partly indeed owing to that very limitation—a keen insight into the things of the spirit, while a rich imagination almost tropical in its luxuriance enables him to clothe the forms of the invisible world in shapes of beauty and in colors so vivid as to give them an almost palpable impressiveness on the visual imagination. In a recent volume entitled *The Unknown Force* he has collected an octave of papers treating briefly of miscellaneous topics, although

through them all is felt the *leit-motif* of love and mercy which lends them a certain, even though loosely tied, unity. The several links in the short chain, while they touch the heart through the imagination, fasten themselves firmly on the intellect. This is especially true of the essay on pain, on the appeal of Christ through art, and the teaching of Christ through ritual. Fr. Kane's thoughts are not the less robust because they are fair and comely to the imaginative eye. (Pp. 157. Herder, St. Louis, Mo.)

Probably many who read these lines will have at some time or other heard "Cadman over the Radio". They will then have given the Rev. Dr. S. Parkes Cadman credit for a mind well stored with facts and ideas, but still more for a vivid and nimble imagination which enables him to alight quickly and gracefully upon an answer to an elusive question or, when need be, to elude an answer if there be none within reach. Dr. Cadman has just completed and issued through the Macmillan Co. a new book—the sixth on his list—entitled *Imagination and Religion.* While the present reader will scarcely be interested in the author's thoughts on Religion, he may find what he has to say on the Imagination suggestive. The powers, the wonders and the perils of the imagination, as well as the part that faculty plays in man's spiritual life and in the Bible, are considered. There is also a chapter entitled the Christ of Romance which tells brightly of the use our Lord made of imagination in parable and similitude—

"The simplest sights we meet—
The Sower flinging seed on loam and rock;
The darnel in the wheat; the mustard tree
That hath its seed so little, and its boughs
Wide-spreading; and the wandering sheep; and nets
Shot in the wimpled waters,—drawing forth
Great fish and small;—these, and a hundred such,
Seen by us daily, never seen aright,
Were pictures for Him from the page of life,
Teaching by parable."

The third volume of *Institutiones Theologiae Dogmaticae in usum Scholarum,* auctore Ludovico Lercher, S.J., Professor at the Innsbruck University, has just come to hand. Concerning the other parts of the course, prior or subsequent, the reviewer has no knowledge. All he can say of the work is that the volume mentioned above contains a solidly learned and theologically profound treatment *de Verbo Incarnato* and *de Gratia Christi.* Both as regards matter, method and style, the work commends itself as a model text book. (Innsbruck: Felician Rauch; New York: Frederick Pustet Co. Pp. 611.)

After the foregoing item had been written there came to hand a recent issue of *The Freiburg Theological Studies* entitled *Der Intuitions Begriff in der Katholischen Religions-Philosophie der Gegenwart* von Dr. Simon Geiger, which happens to extend the subject treated in the book just mentioned so that it covers the latest controversies waging in Germany concerning man's natural knowledge of God and consequently of the object sphere of the Philosophy of Religion. It might be thought that this question had been answered satisfactorily in the thirteenth century by St. Thomas and in the nineteenth by the Vatican Council. But no. The confusion which Kant precipitated into the modern mind when he denounced the validity of the theistic arguments and declared our so-called knowledge to be invalid—not a proven conclusion but a "postulate of the practical reason" — this Kantian scepticism has infiltrated even into some Catholic minds and sent them searching for what they think to be safer foundations for theism and religion in the intuitional penetration of the human spirit. Some, like Hessen, go back to St. Augustine; others, like Laros, to Pascal, Newman, Bergson; others, like Gründler and Switalski, seem to give preponderance to the "religious" or practical as distinguished from the metaphysical element in our awareness of God. The subject bristles with difficulties psychological and epistemological—to say nothing of the theological—and cannot be here discussed. The interested student will find in Dr.

Geiger's monograph a wealth of solid thought and keen criticism set forth with singular clarity. (Freiburg im B., St. Louis, Mo.: Herder.)

Reflections in the retirement of the cloistral retreat, or in the shadow of the Cross of Christ on earth's pilgrim walks, come from the heart of Father Vincent Ferrer Kienberger, a true son of Saint Dominic, in the book *Benedictions from Solitude.* They are some forty brief chapters touching different moods of the human heart, eliciting gratitude, prayer, sorrow for sin, hope, charity, and above all sustaining an abiding spirit of faith in every turn of life. The friendship of Jesus, and all that contributes to our better knowledge and love of Him, are themes for the author's meditation—joy, music, bravery, labor, solitude on the one hand; manners, punctuality, mistakes, haste, and suffering entwined with the manifold motives of religious service on the other, make an attractive chain of "Benedictions", like a rosary which one's thought can dwell upon without wearying. There is a little story at the beginning of each reflection, which furnishes a sort of keynote to what follows. It all makes easy spiritual reading. (The Macmillan Co., New York.)

If we have called attention to Fr. M. V. Kelly's modest volume, *Zeal in the Class Room,* on a former occasion, we wish to do so again, now that the question of higher Catholic education is being discussed with a fresh impulse due to the methods adopted at the Notre Dame University. As Archbishop McNeil of Toronto has pointed out, "the vital question about a graduating student is, not how much he knows, but what he has learnt to admire". Fr. Kelly intended his book as a manual of pastoral theology for clergy and religious engaged as teachers. His instructions, brief and direct, meet a condition in not only the academic schools but in ecclesiastical seminaries, where the secular spirit is gradually supplanting the spiritual by a steady concession to the lower standard of worldliness. From the seminary are drawn the chief leaders in all that makes for true value in life. The book will help to the regaining of the old respect for sanctity, the reverence which goes with high aspirations and spiritual ideals. These are the only practical means for making men contented and hopeful of a better future. Let us put this volume (now in the second edition) in the hands of our ecclesiastical students young and old. (John P. Daleiden Co., Chicago, Ill.)

Quite a novel and in every sense a remarkable book is *L'Art de Vieillir* by the Abbé J. Brugerette, of Thiers, France. It deals with the Christian psychology of old age, not so much for the purpose of teaching us how to grow old as though that were the chief purpose of life; but rather how to learn the values of old age, and to make them available for furthering joy on earth and an assurance of future happiness. The author had previously written on the art of dying, *L'Art de Mourir,* and the present is a complement of the subject in which he gathers the sayings of wise men of every age, illustrating the virtues, the advantages, the worth of the shadows and the means to acquire the best in the growing years. It is an admirable *philosophia senectutis,* interpreted by the leaders of thought in all literature. (Lethielleux: Paris.)

The manner in which the *Catholic World* (June) handles the perplexing problem of the Mexican situation is characteristic of the wisdom and sense of justice which direct the management of that high-class periodical. It presents both sides of the case, authoritatively and ably. Many of us, priests included, are inclined at least to the suspicion that the Government of Mexico is not wholly to blame for persecuting the Church in Mexico. Perhaps the clergy have not lived up to a very high ideal. Where there is so much smoke; the fire is somewhere ablaze or smoldering. Those who entertain this view will find it confirmed by reading Professor Castañeda's (teacher of Modern Languages in William and Mary College) blunt and rather severe critique. On the other hand, the suspicion gets a stunning blow when one turns to the rejoinder by Profesor Charles Phillips. Both professors write with an intimate first-hand experience of the actual facts and conditions,

especially of the historical genesis of the trouble. Both speak out candidly and fully. But, after reading Mr. Castañeda's scathing criticism of the Mexican ecclesiastics one needs to have the editorial assurance that he as well as Professor Phillips is a "loyal and practical Catholic". After perusing Professor Phillips' rejoinder, however, the reader should have no difficulty in deciding upon which side the weight of logic tilts the scale, to say nothing of genuine Catholic loyalty.

Amongst the other good things, solid as well as timely, provided by the same issue of the *Catholic World* are the Abbé Lagan's enlightening study of *Church and State in France* — a problem no less perplexing than that of the Mexican trouble. Monsignor Kirlin gives a sketch of the history of the Eucharistic Congresses held during the past two generations. The paper is a fitting preparation for the Eucharistic Triumph on the borders of Lake Michigan. The first installment of a series of three articles on G. K. C. by Fr. Prendergast, S.J., dealing with the pre-Catholic stage in the career of that brilliant litterateur, is full of interest and whets one's appetite for the coming articles.

But after all these themes of current actualities shall have faded from the reader's mind he will feel his memory haunted by the sweet idyl of the Corpus Christi procession in El Paso and the exquisite episode telling how Maria Sanchez, the poor little peon maiden, sacrificed her candle that had been her soul's dearest treasure on the *fiesta de Dios*. If the June *Catholic World* contained nothing more than this exquisite story of modest heroism it would have justified its existence as an organ of sound Catholic sentiment and literary art.

Books on the Little Flower continue to multiply. One of the more recent is entitled *The Spirit of Saint Thérèse* as shown by her writings and the testimony of eye-witnesses. Much of the material is drawn from the Process of her Beatification and Canonization and from the Discourse of Benedict XV. The matter is systematically arranged so as to bring out her "little way"—the way of love, the source of her energy, and of the detailed virtues to which that way led her. Clients of this wonderful saint, who seems to have captured the admiration and devotion of the whole Catholic world in a degree seemingly unparalleled, will find this brief summary, done out of the French at the Carmel of Kilmacud, Ireland, edifying and instructive. (P. J. Kenedy & Sons, N. Y. Pp. 227.)

This is the season when school managers are arranging courses, selecting text books, and so on for the fall opening. Those who are looking for the right kind of a Reader for the grades will do well to examine the Corona Series. They commend themselves for the appositeness and literary value of their selections, the well-ordered arrangement of the material, the practical pedagogical apparatus, and the general make-up of the volumes. The *Fourth Reader* has just been issued. (Ginn & Co., Boston, Mass.)

As regards text books for the classes in United States History, the task of selection is lessened by the recent appearance of a manual entitled *America's Story*, arranged for the lower grades of Catholic schools by William J. Kennedy, Ph.D., dean of the Teachers' College, Boston, and Sister Mary Joseph, Ph.D., Dominican Sister teaching in Caldwell, N. Y.

The aim of the editors has been to help our boys and girls not simply to become acquainted with the general history of the United States, but to know and properly estimate the part their co-religionists have taken in the founding, freeing, establishing and developing of their country. Told as a continuous story, the narrative will hold the interest of youthful readers—an interest further secured by the large number of illustrations. The didactic purpose of the manual is also secured by the many maps, questionnaires and suggestions for personal research and supplementary reading. (Benziger Brothers, N. Y.)

The countless clients of our Lady of Lourdes not only in France, but also throughout the entire Church

wherever the French language is understood, will welcome the issuance of the *Histoire de Notre Dame de Lourdes,* by L. Jos. Marie Cros, S.J. This is the great documented history of the marvels that centre in and radiate from the world-famed shrine of Massabielle. The author himself examined more than two hundred of the original witnesses: the diocesan archives of Tarbes were at his disposal, as well as those of the prefecture, the commissariate of police, the mayoralty and the courts. He drew upon memoirs and records made by some of the chief witnesses. He utilized his own personal conversations with Bernadette on the details of the apparitions. In a word, no source of information bearing upon the history of Lourdes has been omitted. The two volumes to follow will carry the story of the Grotto and of Bernadette down to her death in 1879. Her recent beatification lends a certain timeliness to this monumental history and biography.

Counsels of Jesus to Sister Benigna is a wee booklet containing a selection of thoughts and aspirations which that favored soul received from her Divine Spouse and, at the command of her spiritual director, wrote down. They breathe the spirit of tender piety and absolute trust. The pamphlet, which is compiled from the translation of her life by M. S. Pine, provides reflections for devout souls, especially during Lent. (John J. Daleiden Co., Chicago, Ill.)

The *Festausgabe* issued by the Görres Gesellschaft to commemorate the seventieth birthday of their honored president, Heinrich Finke, possesses a value aside from its festal relation. Under the general title *Betrachtungen über Geschichte* the author, Professor Adolph Dyroff, brings together three essays in which historical erudition, philosophical wisdom and literary grace associate in apt proportions. The first paper, especially "The Beautiful in History" (*Das Schöne in der Geschichte*), embodies a fine type of historiography (Köln: Verlag J. P. Bachem).

Schools in which Long's *Outlines of American Literature* is used will find *Readings in American Literature* an excellent companion volume. Aside from its scholastic service the book answers the purpose of a handy, well indexed and annotated anthology of American literature. (Ginn & Co., Boston, pp. 434.)

The same publishers have issued, in *America's Message* (pp. 360), a collection of selections from American literature, both prose and verse, "which reveal the significant ideals of American life and through which an understanding patriotism and a finer appreciation of the spirit of America may be upbuilt in high-school students."

It not unfrequently happens that youths whose knowledge of English grammar and composition is sadly deficient, find their way into high school or preparatory seminary. Otherwise fairly well equipped, they nevertheless need to be reëstablished in linguistics. For such cases a review of grammar is imperative. Probably Professor Roscoe Parker had those unfortunates in mind when he constructed his *Review of the Essentials of English Composition.* (Ginn & Co., pp. 150.) At any rate he has compiled a manual admirably suited to the purpose just indicated or any other like emergency. Both as regards matter and method it is a model text book on its theme.

Amongst the many valuable publications which Catholic students owe to the Milanese Società Editrice, "Vita e Pensiero", not the least instructive and stimulating is Mario Casotti's *Lettre su la Religione* (pp. 200). Casotti, it may be not unnecessary to say here, spent the earlier part of his life in the ranks of the philosophical idealists, and his writings during that period reflect the misleading lights of Croce and Gentili. Like his famous compatriot Papini, however, he came to see the logical untenableness of the subjectivist and immanentist philosophisms and he felt himself compelled to turn a *volte face* and go over to the other side, the ranks of Catholic philosophy. In these letters, addressed by "Il tuo

Teofilo" to his "Caro Filandro", he develops the ground of his new (which is the old) faith and with strong feeling urges the claims of Catholicism upon the heart as well as the head; it being, as he insists, the divinely instituted response to the needs and aspirations of human nature. The letters commend themselves not less for their literary grace than for their strength of thought and fervor of sentiment—"dettate da un pensiero sicuro, caldo di convizione e di sentimento."

Fr. Felix Anizan, a well-known writer of spiritual books, has recently issued through Lethielleux (Paris) a small volume of two hundred pages entitled *Le Centre du Plan Divin*, in which he brings together a considerable weight of traditional authoritative testimony and theological augmentation for the thesis that the Sacred Heart of Jesus occupies the central point of God's plan. Christ himself is that centre, but in the God-man, His Heart taken materially — as the manifestative organ of His emotions and the symbol of His Divine love— is the focal point of the creative plan. The thought is well reasoned out and the book will help to strengthen devotion to the Sacred Heart.

The series of scholarly monographs on questions of ecclesiastical history which the house of Victor Lecoffre (Paris) inaugurated about three decades ago is growing slowly but by solid accretions. The most recent addition is *Les Papes du XI^e Siècle et la Chrétienté*, by Jules Gay, professor at the University of Lille (pp. 445). Opening with the development of Christianity during the Carlovingian epoch, the story is carried across the subsequent chaos of Western Europe, through the reign of the Third Otto and the pontificates of Gregory V, Silvester II, and the successive Popes, and onward till it reaches its climax under Henry IV and Gregory VII, with Canossa in the background and the Reformations within the Church introduced by the intrepid Pontiff who loved justice and therefore was forced to die in exile. The heresy of Berengarius, the Council of Clermont, the first crusade, are incidents that loom large in the narrative. The work is thoroughly documented—the annotated bibliography occupying over a dozen well-packed pages. The whole is a masterly treatise deserving a place in the scholarly series in which it takes a distinguished place.

The Bureau of the *Central Verein* (St. Louis, Mo.) issues in its "Timely Topics" series (XX) a slender pamphlet (pp. 24) entitled *Stopping the Leak*, which should be widely circulated. Leakage from the Church is largely due to ignorance of her teaching. The writer, Josephine Van Dyke Brownson, addresses primarily the Catholic Instruction League on the matter and methods of their work. Her plans and suggestions are valuable and eminently practical. Priests will therefore find the brochure a helpful adjunct in their ministry of the Word.

Books Received

LA FETE SPÉCIALE DE JÉSUS-CHRIST ROI. Par le R. P. Édouard Hugon, O.P., Maitre en Théologie, Professeur de Dogme au Collège Pontifical "Angélique" de Rome, Membre de l'Académie Romaine de Saint-Thomas d'Aquin. Pierre Téqui, Paris 6^e. 1925. Pp. vi-37. Prix, 2 *fr. franco.*

L'INITIATION MYSTIQUE. Par Dom S. Louismet, O.S.B. Traduit de l'anglais par l'auteur sur sa 3^e édition. P. Téqui, Paris 6^e. 1925. Pp. vii-369. Prix, 10 *fr. franco.*

ST. JOSEPH, OUR PATRON. Prayers taken from Authentic Sources. By the Rev. F. J. Bergs. Especially Suitable for the Month of March. 1925. Pp. 68. Price, $0.10 *postpaid.*

FUNDAMENTOS DE LA FE CATOLICA. Lecciones de Apologetica. Para Uso de los Cursos Superiores de Religion en Seminarios, Institutos, Liceos, Escuelas Normales y Profesionales. Por el Presbitero Nicolas Marin Negueruela. Prologo del Ilmo. Sr. Obispo Tit. de Mariames, Dr. D. Martin Rücker y Sotomayor. Obra premiada por la Universidad de Chile. Tomo I: Parte I, Espiritualismo. Tomo II: Parte II, Cristianismo; Parte III, Catolicismo. Tipografia Catolica Casals, Barcelona. 1925. Pp. xv-248 y 464. Precio: del tomo I, 4 *ptas.;* del tomo II, 7 *ptas.*

THE LITTLE FLOWER AND THE BLESSED SACRAMENT. By the Rev. Joseph Husslein, S.J. Benziger Brothers, New York, Cincinnati, Chicago. 1925. Pp. 196. Price, $0.55 *postpaid.*

ASCETICAL ASCENT OF THE LOVE OF GOD. Progressive Meditations on Divine Charity. By Paulin Giloteaux. Adapted from the French by William Reany, S.T.L., Chaplain of Westminster Cathedral. P. J. Kenedy & Sons, New York. 1925. Pp. 128. Price, $1.35 *postpaid.*

MARIE-EUSTELLE HARPAIN (1814-1842). Une Amante de Jésus-Hostie. Par Élie Maire, Aumônier au Collège Stanislas. P. Lethielleux, Paris. 1925. Pp. xix-377. Prix, 9 *fr.* 90 *franco.*

CUESTIONARIO DE APOLOGETICA. Para Uso de los Cursos Superiores de Religion en Seminarios, Institutos, Liceos, Escuelas Normales y Professionales. Por el Presbitero Nicolas Marin Negueruela, Profesor de Teologia y Apologetica. Tipografia Catolica Casals, Barcelona; Luis Gili, Corcega; El Inmaculado Corazon de Maria, Santiago de Chile. 1925. Pp. 24. Precio, o *pesetas* 50.

LES SAINTS ANGES. Par le Chanoine Eugène Duplessy, Directeur de *La Reponse.* (*Cours supérieur de Religion,* 20.) La Bonne Presse, Paris. 1925. Pp. 72.

INSTITUTIONES THEOLOGIAE DOGMATICAE in usum scholarum auctore Ludovico Lercher, S.J., S. Theologiae Doctore eiusque in Universitate Oenipontana Professore. Volumen tertium continens libros duos: De Verbo incarnato (de B.V.M. et cultu Sanctorum); De gratia Christi. Typis et Sumptibus Feliciani Rauch, Oeniponte. 1925. Pp. 611.

THE LIFE OF ST. FRANCIS DE SALES. Adapted from the Abbé Hamon's *Vie de S François de Sales* by the Rev. Harold Burton. Vol. I. P. J. Kenedy & Sons, New York. 1925. Pp. xii-516. Price, $6.15 *postpaid.*

GRUNDLAGEN UND GEISTESHALTUNG DER KATHOLISCHEN FRÖMMIGKEIT. Von Dr. Bernard Poschmann, Prof. der Theologie in Braunsberg. (Band XV, *Der Katholische Gedanke.* Veröffentlichungen des Verbandes der Vereine Katholischer Akademiker zur Pflege der Katholischen Weltanschauung.) Oratoriums Verlag, Köln, München, Wien. 1925. S. 150. Preis, 3 *M.* 50.

THE OFFICIAL CATHOLIC DIRECTORY for 1926. Containing Ecclesiastical Statistics of the United States, Alaska, Philippine Islands, the Canal Zone, the Virgin Islands, the Island of Guam, the U. S. Possessions in Samoa, Hawaiian Islands, Porto Rico, British Honduras, C. A., Jamaica, B. W. I., Canada, Newfoundland, Ireland, England, Scotland, Wales, Cuba and Mexico. Complete edition. P. J. Kenedy & Sons, New York. Pp. iv-1634.

SEGUNDO ANUARIO ECLESIASTICO DE LA IGLESIA CATOLICA EN CENTRO-AMERICA. Por Pedro Buissink, Parroco, Santa Ana, El Salvador, C. A. Impreso en la Tipografia Comercial, Santa Ana. 1925. Pp. 264.

HOI-AH! Andy Carroll's First Year at Holy Cross. By Irving T. McDonald. Benziger Brothers, New York, Cincinnati, Chicago. 1926. Pp. 187. Price, $1.25 *net.*

THE PERFECT CALENDAR FOR EVERY YEAR OF THE CHRISTIAN ERA. Designed for Practical Every-Day Use. By Henry Fitch. With a Chronological Record of Important Events in the History of the World from B. C. 10,000 to 1926 A. D. Revised edition. Funk & Wagnalls Co., New York and London. 1926. Pp. 42. Price, $1.50 *net.*

CATHOLIC DIRECTORY OF INDIA, CEYLON AND BURMA. 1926. Catholic Supply Co., Madras. Pp. 554.

ANNUAL SCHOOL REPORT OF THE DIOCESE OF CLEVELAND. 1924-1925. Pp. 32.

IDEALS OF LIFE. Graduation Play for Boys and Girls, in Dialogues, Songs and Five Pictures. By the Rev. M. Helfen. Catholic Dramatic Co., Brooten, Minn. 1926. Pp. 15. Price, $0.30.

THOSE EARLIEST DAYS. By Tychicus. D. Appleton & Co., New York. Pp. xi-330.

MONICA, or The Chronicle of Marcus. A Poem Founded on the Life and Character of the Mother of St. Augustine. By Samuel Valentine Cole. Marshall Jones Co., Boston. 1926. Pp. 89. Price, $1.50.

SCHOOL BOOKS: *American Patriotism.* American Ideals in the Words of America's Great Men. Compiled by Merton E. Hill, Pp. xvi-241. Price, $1.00. *Book of Modern Essays.* Compiled and edited by John M. Avent. Pp. xiii-244. Price, $1.20. *Por España.* By Gertrude M. Walsh. Pp. xii-202. Price, $1.00. *English Literature.* By George N. Shuster. Pp. x-527. Price, $1.60. Allyn & Bacon, Boston, New York, Chicago, Atlanta, San Francisco and Dallas. 1926.

SCHOOL BOOKS FROM ALLYN & BACON. *Le Petit Chose.* By Alphonse Daudet. Edited with Introduction, Notes, Exercises and Vocabulary by Winfield S. Barney. Pp. xii-186. Price, $0.80. *Twelfth Night.* Edited with a Life of Shakespeare, an Account of the Theatre in His Time, and Numerous Aids to the Study of the Play. By Samuel Thurber, Jr., and Mary E. Adams. Pp. x-236. Price, $0.65. *Cuentos, Romances y Cantares.* A Collection of Spanish Popular Tales, Ballads and Songs. Edited with Conversational Exercises, Notes and Vocabulary. By Aurelio M. Espinosa, Ph.D. Pp. viii-129. Price, $0.80. *Applied English Grammar.* By David Sinclair Burleson. Pp. ix-381. Price, $0.92. *Advanced Algebra.* By Edward I. Edgerton, B.S., and Perry A. Carpenter, Ph.B. Pp. vi-377. Price, $1.40. *Medieval Latin.* Selected and edited by Karl Pomeroy Harrington. Pp. xxxix-698. Price, $2.80. Allyn & Bacon, Boston, New York, Chicago, Atlanta, San Francisco. 1925.

SCHOOL BOOKS FROM GINN & CO. *Spanish Idioms and Phrases.* With Exercises for Practical Use. By J. Moreno-Lacalle. Pp. 90. Price, $0.84. *The Principles of Argumentation.* By George Pierce Baker and Henry Barrett Huntington. New edition. Pp. xiv-616. Price, $2.20. *Willie Fox's Diary.* By Ruth Miller Hilkene and Marie Gugle. Pp. 125. Price, $0.72. *America's Message.* Edited by Will C. Wood, Alice Cecelia Cooper and Frederick A. Rice. Pp. xii-347. *Les Américains chez Nous.* Comédie en Trois Actes. Par Eugène Brieux. With Introduction, Notes and Vocabulary by Irving Foster. Pp. xx-169. Price, $0.80. *Le Bourgeois Gentilhomme.* Comédie-Ballet, 1670. Par Molière. Edited with Introduction, Notes, Questions and Vocabulary by Thomas Edward Oliver, Ph.D. Pp. xxxv-188. Price, $0.64. *An Introduction to the History of Western Europe.* By James Harvey Robinson. New brief edition. Pp. xi-854. Price, $2.96. *Tales of a Grandfather.* History of Scotland from the Earliest Period to the Close of the Reign of James V. By Walter Scott. Abridged and edited by Edwin Ginn. Illustrated by Rodney Thomson. Pp. viii-351. Price, $0.72. *Manual of Elementary French.* With Exercises. By Isidore H. B. Spiers. Pp. viii-65. Price, $0.80. *General High School Mathematics.* Book I. By David Eugene Smith, John Albert Foberg and William David Reeve. Pp. viii-472. Price, $1.60. *A Review of the Essentials of English Composition.* By Roscoe E. Parker, A.M. Pp. vii-145. Price, $1.40. *Unified Kindergarten and First-Grade Teaching.* By Samuel Chester Parker and Alice Temple. Pp. xv-600. Price, $2.20. *Literary Contrasts.* Selected and edited by C. Alphonso Smith. Pp. ix-432. Price, $2.36. *Glückauf.* A First German Reader. By Margarethe Müller and Carla Wenckebach. Pp. xiii-303. Price, $1.20. *Outlines of English Literature.* With Readings. By William J. Long. Pp. xv-441. Price, $1.80. Ginn & Co., Boston, New York, Chicago, London, Atlanta, Dallas, Columbus, San Francisco. 1925.